

MAY, 1887.

# The Congregational Review

IN WHICH ARE INCORPORATED

The Congregationalist and British Quarterly Review.

EDITED BY THE

REV. J. GUINNESS ROGERS, B.A.

---

## CONTENTS.

1. THE NONCONFORMIST PROTEST.
2. THE "WISDOM" OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Rev. S. G. GREEN, D.D.
3. CHRISTIANITY AND THE SERVICE OF MAN. By Rev. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.
4. FIRST REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMISSION.
5. MISS EDNA LYALL'S NEW STORY.
6. THE CONVERTING POWER IN THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.
7. EVANGELISM IN FANEUIL HALL.
8. THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ITS PROPERTY.
9. EDITORIAL NOTES.
10. REVIEW.
11. CURRENT LITERATURE.

---

London :

T. FISHER UNWIN,

26, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

One Shilling.]

[Monthly.

# The Congregational Review.

## NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

All Orders or Communications in reference to Advertisements, also Remittances for the insertion of Advertisements, must be sent direct to MESSRS. REYNELL AND SON, General Advertising Agents, No. 44, Chancery Lane, London, W.C., and not to the Publisher or Editor.

### TERMS:—

For Cover and Facing Matter.					
One Page	...	...	...	...	£1 0 0
Half "	...	...	...	...	2 5 0
Quarter Page	...	...	...	...	1 5 0
For Ordinary Positions.					
One Page	...	...	...	...	£3 0 0
Half "	...	...	...	...	1 15 0
Quarter Page	...	...	...	...	1 0 0
One-Eighth "	...	...	...	...	0 12 6

Bills, not exceeding 4pp., £2 2s. 0d. for the edition. A Reduction on Series.

Advertisements for the next issue must be sent before May 15.

### THE MAKING OF NEW ENGLAND, 1580-1643. By SAMUEL

ADAMS DRAKE. With many Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s.

"A clear and pleasantly written account of the settlement and early days of the Colonies of New England. . . . The value of this useful little volume is enhanced by a large number of maps, plans, and other illustrations."—*Saturday Review*.

### BY THE AUTHOR OF "HINDU MYTHOLOGY."

**MODERN HINDUISM:** Being an Account of the Religion and Life of the Hindus in Northern India. By W. J. WILKINS, of the London Missionary Society, Author of "Hindu Mythology—Vedic and Puranic." Demy 8vo, cloth, 16s.

"He writes in a liberal and comprehensive spirit, and though he does not let us forget his calling, he is intent on higher objects than merely to demonstrate the arduous task undertaken by the missionary in India."—*Saturday Review*.

LONDON: T. FISHER UNWIN, 26, PATERNOSTER SQUARE, E.C.

### ESTABLISHED 1851.

**BIRKBECK BANK.**—Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane. Three per cent. Interest allowed on Deposits, repayable on demand. Two per cent. Interest on current accounts calculated on the minimum monthly balances, when not drawn below £100. The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuable; the collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks, Shares, and Annuities. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued. The BIRKBECK ALMANACK, with full particulars, post free, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Five Millions.

**HOW TO PURCHASE A HOUSE FOR TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH,** with immediate Possession and no Rent to Pay. Apply at the office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY, 26, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

**HOW TO PURCHASE A PLOT OF LAND FOR FIVE SHILLINGS PER MONTH,** with immediate possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes. Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY. THE BIRKBECK ALMANACK, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT Manager.







# The Congregational Review.

---

MAY, 1887.

---

## THE NONCONFORMIST PROTEST.

ONE of the most significant documents which has appeared in the course of this unhappy Home Rule controversy is the protest of 3,200 Nonconformist ministers against the Government policy of Coercion. It may safely be said that there has seldom, if ever, been so strong an expression of independent opinion from men who have no personal or even party objects to subserve. From whatever point it be viewed it is a noteworthy incident, and when the fierce passions of the hour have subsided, will certainly have the weight to which it is justly entitled. The number of the signatures is very considerable, and since the publication in *The Daily News* has been increased by some hundreds. There are a few eminent names of Congregational ministers which are conspicuous by their absence, but of these some have expressed full sympathy with the "protest" itself though declining for reasons which we are bound to respect to join in this united public action. Of the others, Dr. Dale has published his reasons, which we shall presently examine more fully, and they are such as show that after all he is not far apart from his brethren. But not only is there the great mass of Congregational ministers, but there are also Presbyterians, and some Wesleyans including the Rev. H. Price Hughes, and a large number from the other sections of the Methodist family. In short, it is a document thoroughly representative of the opinion of Protestant Dissenting ministers. And here is one remarkable feature of the case. We have ourselves had letters denouncing these

Nonconformist ministers as allies of sacerdotalism, and we know not what wicked things besides—letters which proved, if such proof be wanting, that the “No Popery” spirit which little more than a century ago stirred up riots compared with which the Socialist disturbances were but child’s play, is not dead. Happily it is as alien to the spirit as it is contrary to the principles of Dissent, as this document sufficiently demonstrates. The men who signed it are among the sturdiest Protestants in England, but their Protestantism is of such a type that it only makes them the more resolved to do justice to a Roman Catholic people.

Of course our action has had to face a good deal of the criticism which assumes that all who differ from the critics must be lacking either in sense or honesty. *The Times* began with a suggestion that Mr. Gladstone had been employing his blandishments, and that there was some mysterious connection between the Irish question and Disestablishment. The insinuation is strangely inconsistent with the reproaches addressed to us by some of the Radical Unionists, who complain that we are following a statesman who has no sympathy with our special aims in preference to one who has long been a consistent champion of religious equality. There is more justification for this taunt than for the charge that we have been influenced by corrupt motives. It needs very little discernment to see that we have nothing to hope from Mr. Gladstone in the way of Disestablishment. We might go further, and say that, of all sections of the Liberal party, none has more reason to be dissatisfied with his policy. If, after his own declaration in the Midlothian campaign of 1885, we had committed ourselves to his cause in the expectation that he would be the leader of a great movement for Disestablishment we should be of all men the most credulous. He told us some time ago that his age alone would prevent him from entering on so gigantic an undertaking, and certainly the lapse of years has not mitigated that difficulty. Our critics may regard our action as extremely unwise, but they will injure only their own reputation by imputing to us folly so egregious as is implied in the suggestion that we follow a

veteran statesman of seventy-seven years of age in the hope that when he has settled the question of Home Rule he will signalize his eightieth year by embarking in the most difficult enterprize which has ever taxed the resources of English statesmanship.

But why should it be necessary to suppose that our action is due to other than conscientious motives? There are some of the Liberal "Unionists" (we prefer to call them by the name they assume without inquiring as to their right to its exclusive use or resenting their application to us of an obnoxious epithet which we disclaim), who are so occupied in admiring their own conscientiousness that they forget that others have consciences as well as they, and who are just as anxious to preserve their consistency. Mr. Courtney's prophesyings at Truro about our modern political martyrs would have been more impressive if they had not been so Pharisaic in their tone, and if they had not come from one who has found so comfortable a resting-place in the easy chair of the Committees of the House of Commons. Mr. Dicey in his speech at the dinner of the "Liberal Union Club," according to *The Spectator*, which tells us that it was the most eloquent of the evening though left unreported, "maintained that the Unionists had every chance of success, for that hitherto the moral party had always triumphed in England, and *they were the moral party.*" The assumption is a cool one. Surely if ever there was a party which needed the exhortation of the wise man, "Let another praise thee and not thine own lips," it is these Unionists. From the first we have been told, *usque ad nauseam*, that they are the intellectual Liberals; now we are asked to believe that they are the "moral" section also. They can hardly suppose that the world will endorse their flattering verdict on themselves, or that this remarkable self-complacency is an element of real power. We know of no Liberals out of this country who would sustain their pretensions. It is easy to say that Americans who, of all others, are most competent to form an opinion on such points, are influenced by regard to the Irish vote, but this cannot apply to religious men (such men, for

example, as our own Dr. Storrs), who are not in any sense professional politicians, and yet their utterances are just as emphatic as those of a more interested class. We do not claim their judgment as decisive, but it may at least serve to show that there is room for difference of opinion among men who are equally concerned for the interests of morality. We do not arrogate to ourselves any monopoly of moral feeling, but it would certainly be a phenomenon if 3,700 Protestant Dissenting ministers (for the additions since the publication have raised the number even beyond this figure) had come forward as the public champions of an immoral cause. The case in favour of the Bill has nowhere been stated with more temper and moderation than by Dr. Dale :

If the vote is to be taken to-morrow, I should like to be allowed to say that I could not vote for the resolution of which Mr. Alderman Hart has given notice, and for the following reasons : 1. I believe that it is one of the elementary duties of Government to provide for the detection and punishment of crime. 2. I believe that in some districts in Ireland the action of the ordinary law is paralysed by intimidation, and can no longer offer protection against outrage and violence. 3. I believe that in these districts the Government ought to have exceptional powers of the kind which were given by the Act of 1882, and which, administered by Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan, produced a great diminution of crime.

So far as the present Bill follows the lines of the Act of 1882 I approve of it. But I object very strongly to the proposal in Section 10 of the Bill to try persons accused of crime in Ireland before English juries; and I further object to some of the powers granted under Sections 6 and 7, which, in the judgment of so high an authority as Sir George Trevelyan, might be used for the suppression of political associations free from all complicity with crime. I should, therefore, ask for the amendment of the Bill—not for its rejection.

The resolution of the 2000 of Birmingham against which this is directed was couched in the same terms as our own protest, and this letter may therefore be regarded as our friend's criticism of our action. It is a criticism which must be infinitely more gratifying to us than to the Ministerialists and their "Liberal" supporters. Lord Hartington, who receives far too much consideration from Mr. Gladstone, and whose speeches are in fact full of Toryism,

has told us with a frankness which is one of his best attributes that the object of the Bill is to put down the revolutionary party, *i.e.*, the Nationalist party in Ireland. His assumption is that with that party there is a life and death conflict, and that the present Bill is the instrument for carrying on that conflict, but it would lose this character altogether if it were amended on the lines indicated by Dr. Dale. A measure thus emasculated would be discussed in a very different spirit from that which the present Bill has evoked. None of us would deny the Government powers necessary for the repression of crime, and the only question which could arise as to a Bill directed to that object alone would be whether a case for legislation had been made out, and whether the legislation proposed was that best adapted to secure the end.

It is pleasant to see how far we are in agreement with one for whom we have so strong an affection that separation from him must necessarily be painful. We have really very little to say even in qualification of Dr. Dale's statements in favour of the Bill. We doubt whether there is sufficient evidence to support the second, but however this may be, we should not be disposed to take any strong exception to the proposal to re-enact some of the provisions of the Crimes Bill of 1882, with this provision only, that they should be applied to the United Kingdom as a whole. But that is a matter for argument into which we need not enter here. Suffice it to say, that those who have signed the protest are as deeply impressed with the perils of lawlessness, as anxious to repress outrage and intimidation of every kind, as ready to uphold the Government in its conflict against crime, as the most zealous Unionist of them all.

Our objections to the Bill are precisely the same as those set forth by Dr. Dale. The clauses which he opposes are those which have roused our indignation, but they are what make it a weapon of political oppression, and which constitute its chief, if not its sole, value in the estimation of its promoters. We find this element of encouragement in his letter—it must express not only his own views, but

those of others of the party who are not prepared to sacrifice their Radical principles to the one object of keeping Mr. Gladstone out of office. If those who sympathize with his objections give effect to them in Committee, there is yet hope that the Bill may be rendered comparatively harmless. But if this be done we shall be deprived of the inestimable services of the remarkable Government which we are told is fighting the battle of Imperial unity and order, although it is composed for the most part of the men who in the election of 1885 were the allies of those whom they now denounce as traitors and the friends of murderers and dynamitards. Were it not that the defeat of the measure would involve the fall of the Government it is doubtful whether the Bill would have a chance at all. But it would seem as though most of the "Unionists" would pay any price to defeat Mr. Gladstone, and their Tory taskmasters are determined that the price shall be sufficiently heavy. As Sir George Trevelyan has shown in his admirable letter to the Aberdeen Unionists, who would not have him because he would not have coercion, this admirable party, which plumes itself on its morality, changes its attitude, and indeed its principles, to suit circumstances. When Mr. Gladstone proposed bills which it did not like, he must be sacrificed on the shrine of conscience; but when a Tory Ministry introduce a measure, equally opposed to the consciences of these gentlemen, conscience must be sacrificed at the shrine of hatred to Mr. Gladstone. We cannot but feel, therefore, that the chances of such amendments as would satisfy Dr. Dale as well as ourselves are but small. That no effort will be spared to defeat any modifications of the kind is evident from the tactics pursued by *The Times*, and which unhappily have received a certain measure of encouragement from Lord Hartington.

Amid the present wild denunciations of the Nationalists, it is to be remembered on their behalf that the Tory party were not ashamed to negotiate with them in June, 1885, and to accept their aid until it became evident that the alliance would not give them the majority by

which they could retain office. Lord Randolph Churchill now knows no limit to his vituperation, and seems to expect that the world will be as forgetful of his former words and deeds as he seems to be himself; but no one was more active in the intrigues which disgraced the close of the Parliament of 1880-85. It may be said that the real character of the Irish party was not then understood; but the defence is not available. "Parnellism and Crime" is only an expansion of Mr. Forster's charges against the party. The facsimile letter is a novelty, but if genuine it would only be a repetition of the offences previously alleged though in a more aggravated form. But the Tories in 1885 not only consorted with Parnellites, they traduced and misrepresented the defenders of order and of unity. Further, Lord Spencer did not vapour about the repression of crime and outrage; he exposed his life in the endeavour to do it, and he succeeded only to meet with the contumely of the Tory party then in league with Mr. Parnell.

To represent our action as a protest against the "repression of crime," is a misstatement which might be characterized in very strong terms were it not that the prejudices of some men distorts their views of facts in such extraordinary fashion. "'Force is no remedy' for the suppression of the political discontent at present existing in Ireland"—a lesson taught in other and better days by Mr. John Bright—is the governing sentence of the document. Whether increased power is necessary for the repression of crime, is a matter of opinion on which no judgment is expressed. Whether "political discontent" should be put down by force, is a matter of principle about which ministers of the gospel have a title and, as we think, a special fitness to speak. It has been said that the law is only made for the disobedient, and that an Irishman can escape its penalties by not violating its provisions. Of course, if those provisions had relation to actual crime this would be true enough. But this Bill will fail of its object if it does not prevent the formation of political associations and the expression of political opinions. Can



any true Liberal, much more a Nonconformist like Mr. Caine, assert that no man has a right to complain of such a law since it will not reach him if he is content to be silent as to his political convictions? There was a law once passed by the ancestors of the party now in power which made it criminal to attend a conventicle. Will it be maintained that the law was unobjectionable inasmuch as no Dissenter needed to incur its penalties, and all might be perfectly free by abstaining from conventicles altogether?

Is there not reason for such a declaration at the present time? For the whole of this century England has been pursuing this policy of repression, and the result is a discontent more bitter, and an enmity more intense, than at any previous period of this melancholy history. We are told that the representatives of the Irish people are men of such evil repute and wicked association, that the nation which sets up such leaders cannot be trusted with the rights of freemen. Unfortunately it has been trusted, and the men whom it elects form more than an eighth of the governing body of the British Empire. These men, however, have but succeeded to the heritage of abuse which has been the invariable lot of Irish patriots. Mr. J. H. McCarthy, in his admirable little volume on "Ireland since the Union," says,

In the Conservative party of to-day O'Connell is exalted at the expense of Mr. Parnell; . . . Irishmen are assured that if they (Ireland) had such a man as O'Connell at her head, her demands would be more readily listened to by her appreciative rulers. Yet if Irishmen took the trouble to refer back to the dusty files of newspapers of O'Connell's time, they would not find there was any evidence of this latter-day admiration. Then no epithet was strong enough, no adjective sufficiently offensive, to fling at O'Connell.

So the men who abused O'Connell could admire Lord Edward Fitzgerald, or Robert Emmett. In truth, the patriot hero becomes the more illustrious to the successors of his former enemies, as his figure grows more dim in the ever-lengthening vista of the past. It may be that there has been a gradual deterioration in the tone of the Irish leaders, and that we have fallen upon men of a more



savage type. But if it be so, so much the worse for a Government whose policy has led the Irish to trust such men, in the belief that they would at all events be loyal to their country, and secure her her rights. What the 3,700 Nonconformists have done is to raise their voice against the continuance of a policy whose failures are written broad over the history of a century. Eighty-six failures ought surely to be sufficient to teach us our folly, without our rushing madly into an eighty-seventh. We have lately had some indignant denials of the assertion that coercion has always been a failure, and the Act of 1882 has been cited to the contrary. But the denial does not traverse our contention. We do not say that crime cannot be repressed; and that Act, as we are told by its administrators, was worked with this view only and to that extent, it succeeded. But the success we desire is the reconciliation of Ireland and Great Britain, and the prospect of that is more hopeful to-day than it was then. The change is due, not to the action of any Coercion Bill, but to the growth of a conviction that there is a large and increasing party in England disposed to deal with Ireland on new and better principles.

The "protest" of Nonconformist ministers is another evidence of this fact, and another contribution to the formation of that better sentiment. It looks beyond the mere controversies of the hour, and lays down a great principle in the application of which lies the only hope of establishing happier relations between the two peoples. Is there any man of sane mind who can believe that the present Bill will do anything but inaugurate a fresh conflict, and is there any Christian patriot who can contemplate the possibilities of such a struggle without a feeling akin to alarm? We have had a foretaste of its bitterness and of the excesses into which it may be betrayed in the monstrous stories with which *The Times* has seen fit to crowd its columns, and which, when (as in the case of some of the worst) they have been disproved, it has scarcely had the grace to retract. While the passions of Englishmen are thus lashed to fury, of course there is a corresponding exasperation on the opposite side, and thus we have before us a

prospect of incessant strife, possibly diversified by incidents of the most painful nature. Does any reasonable politician believe that the English democracy will persevere in a struggle which will not only postpone indefinitely the reforms for which it has waited too long, but which must certainly be attended with grave national dangers on which we do not care to dwell? No. Sooner or later the more excellent way of conciliation must be tried, and we hold that Christian ministers who preach a gospel of love were acting within their own sphere when they urge that it should be tried now.

It has been said that while we were perfectly justified in expressing our individual opinion that we had no right to act together as ministers. We do not know whether Mr. Spurgeon intended to endorse this view by some remarks in the Address to his students, but if it be so we must, with all respect for a friend whom we honour and love—despite the oracular utterances which lessen his influence among those he would most desire to affect to an extent he little suspects—still hold to our own opinion. We know not how these distinctions between the man and the minister are to be maintained. When Mr. Spurgeon penned his too celebrated letter on Mr. Gladstone's Irish Measures he wrote as an individual, but when that letter was published there was behind it all the weight of the most powerful name in the Nonconformist ministry, and everywhere it was so quoted. So in the election of 1885 we were met by a letter from Mr. Statham, which derived all its value from the fact that it came from a Dissenting minister. The party who so used it are insisting now that we have no right to speak in our official character. In the present instance a number of ministers have united in the expression of an opinion, but how this affects the question we are unable to see. Nor need any such complaints trouble us for a moment. There are those who do entertain these scruples, but these are only the few, and we can only regret that we cannot defer to their consciences without being unfaithful to our own. Were we to make one such concession we should infallibly be led to the position of those who hold that a Christian can

have nothing to do with politics, and who (if we may judge from one of the class with whom we were unfortunately thrown into contact) find this principle quite compatible with a fierce Tory passion and prejudice.

But the majority of the objectors are not of this class. They dislike the "protest" itself. Had it been an expression of confidence in Lord Hartington, the true leader in this reactionary movement, and an approval of Coercion, those who signed it would have been covered with praises as fulsome as those which *The Times* bestows on every man who is recreant to the Liberal principles of earlier days. Political sympathies colour judgments on both sides. We are old enough to remember the outcry raised against the ministers who took part in the Anti-Corn Law Conference of 1842. They were not affected either by the fierce attacks of interested partizans, the wild declamation of the organs of landlord Philistinism, or the kindlier criticisms of those who doubted the propriety of their particular line of action. These joined in a chorus of condemnation—but the Corn Laws did not long survive that remarkable demonstration. The Nonconformist Conference of 1872 had reference to a subject which seemed more closely related to the internal life and the distinctive work of the Nonconformist churches, but the criticism of opponents who are so jealous for the honour of Nonconformity was not less keen. The promoters of the present movement did not enter upon it without a full calculation of the costs. What they hardly dared to anticipate was the enthusiasm the proposal awakened, and the extraordinary amount of support it has commanded. They have committed no man, and they complain of no one who has felt himself unable to unite in their action. They have not pledged themselves to any particular scheme for the government of Ireland. They felt it their duty to enter their protest against a policy which appears to them unrighteous and offensive; and having done it, they leave the result without fear with Him whose will they have sought to do.

## THE "WISDOM" OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

## PROVERBS AND ECCLESIASTES.

THE division of the Old Testament into "Law, Prophets, and Psalms" or "Hagiographa" is familiar to all readers. Recent criticism has laid much stress upon an element in the last of these three sections, distinct in many points from all the rest and now generally denoted by the term *Khochmah* or "Wisdom." Of this the main examples are in the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, and the wonderful poem of Job. The *Khochmah*, from its extraordinary interest, and from the light which it throws upon Hebrew life and thought in the later Old Testament period, increasingly attracts the attention of scholars in Germany, Great Britain, and America; and now Canon Cheyne has embodied in his most recent volume,\* the conclusions which, if not final, yet accurately represent the state of knowledge and opinion among those most competent to judge. In one respect the book is an astonishment. Professor Cheyne in his "Isaiah" had shown himself so cautious and even conservative a critic that we were hardly prepared for so decided a disregard of the traditional as appears in this new volume; and, if we may suggest a point to which we may have occasion to recur, there seems too great a disposition to cut the knot of difficulties by supposing textual corruption. Dr. Gustav Bickell, whom Canon Cheyne often follows, and oftener half-approvingly quotes, in his suggested emendations, appears to us to carry the critic's license too far. In some cases, indeed, the emendation can plead the authority of the Septuagint; the Greek phrase, re-translated into Hebrew, giving an obviously better text than the Massoretic sentence as it stands. The value of the Septuagint as an aid to textual criticism has yet to be accurately weighed: this, as it appears to us, is the one great service that

\* *Job and Solomon; or, The Wisdom of the Old Testament.* By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation at Oxford, Canon of Rochester. London, 1887.

remains to be rendered to Old Testament exegesis. Many of Canon Cheyne's hints in this direction are valuable and suggestive; but we desiderate a more systematic treatment of the whole subject, which would lead to surer and less apparently arbitrary conclusions.

The "Wise men" themselves are among the most perplexing characters in the Hebrew history. They seem, in the last days of the Kingdom and after the Exile, to have formed a class distinct alike from the priestly and the prophetic orders. Their tone, if not anti-sacerdotal, was singularly free from all traces of Levitical influence. For instance, there is nothing in Proverbs or Ecclesiastes at all resembling the following passage from the apocryphal Ecclesiasticus:

Fear the Lord and honour the priest; and give him his portion as it is commanded thee; the first-fruits, and the trespass-offering, and the sacrifice of sanctification, and the first-fruits of the holy things (Eccelus. vii. 31).

See also the decided priestly tinge in the "praises of famous men" (chaps. xlv., xlvi., l.). In this sacerdotalism of tone we recognize the spirit of Malachi the prophet rather than of the *Khochmah*-school; and this discrepancy between Ecclesiasticus and Ecclesiastes inclines us to place the two books farther apart in point of time than Dr. Cheyne seems disposed to do.

The "Wise men" have certainly more in common with the earlier prophets than with the priestly order. And yet there are signal differences. There is no *Thus saith Jehovah* in the books of Wisdom; for the appearance of "the Lord out of the whirlwind" at the conclusion of Job is a different kind of manifestation from that in the prophetic oracles. Then the prophets were, as truly as the priests, although in another way, representatives of the theocracy. The calling and the history, the sins, disasters, and triumphs of the chosen nation were their themes. On the contrary, the Wise men concern themselves with the individual; the tone of passionate patriotism, appropriate to the members of an elect race, is absent: they are cosmopolitan, universal; and it has been noted that in the whole Book of Proverbs the

word *Israel* does not once appear. That the name of *JEHOVAH* is entirely absent from *Ecclesiastes* is an indication of a similar kind. The religion of the *Khochmah*-writers is of a different character from the intense, high-wrought devotion of the prophets: it is more practical; an ethical philosophy rather than an irresistible enthusiasm. The prophets were surrounded with mystery, and there was a sense of supernatural grandeur in the way in which they appeared at intervals to declare "the burden of the LORD:" the Wise men went about among the people, held classes, probably for instruction, delighted in colloquies and discussions: in fact, the words spoken of Wisdom in the abstract had probably a literal fulfilment in the habits and methods of its professors:

In the top of high places by the way,  
Where the paths meet, she standeth;  
Beside the gates, at the entry of the city,  
At the coming in of the doors, she crieth aloud:  
Unto you, O men, I call;  
And my voice is to the sons of men.

Proverbs viii. 2-4.

Yet it must be confessed that our acquaintance with the ways of these sages is but imperfect. "It is a misfortune," writes Dr. Cheyne, "that our sources for the history of Israelitish 'philosophy' is so scanty."

Were there "wise men" in N. Israel? and, if so, have any of their proverbs come down to us besides the *marshal*, or fable, of Jotham? Did they confine their activity to the capital city or cities, or did they also, like the "scribes," settle or itinerate in the provinces? (Matt. ix. 3; Targ. of Judg. v. 9). Did their public instructions assume anything like the form of the proverbs of our anthologies? Did they teach without fee or reward? At any rate, a post-Exile proverb-writer tells us with retrospective glance where the "wise men" awaited their disciples—not in the quietude of the chamber, but either within the massive city-gates, or in the adjacent squares or broad places on which the streets converged (i. 20, 21; comp. Job xxix. 7). No doubt they had a large stock of sayings in their memory, such as had been tested by the experience of past generations. Sometimes they would modify old proverbs, sometimes they would frame new ones, so that when their disciples gathered round them, they would "bring out of their treasure things new and old." From time to time

they would commit their "wisdom" to writing in a more perfect form, and such records must have formed the basis of the proverbial collections in the Old Testament (p. 124).

This extract indicates our author's views with regard to that most characteristic outcome of Hebrew Wisdom, which we know as the "Proverbs of Solomon." Dr. Cheyne regards the reputation for wisdom of the great son of David as partly due to the idealizing tendency of popular tradition. His "three thousand proverbs," suggests the critic, were probably not apophthegms, like those in the book that bears his name, but "moralizing similitudes, derived partly from the animal, partly from the vegetable kingdom." It is impossible, according to the learned professor, to suppose that the wealthy and luxurious despot can have given as the utterances of his "wisdom" words like these :

Better a little with the fear of Jehovah  
Than great treasure and turmoil therewith (xv. 16).  
The horse is prepared against the day of battle,  
But victory is Jehovah's (xxi. 31).  
The mouth of strange women is a deep pit;  
He with whom Jehovah is wroth falleth therein (xxii. 14).  
A wise son (loveth) his father's correction,  
But a scorner heareth not rebuke (xiii. 1).

For a commentary on these passages, exclaims the Canon, "read 1 Kings iv. 26 ; xi. 1, 4, 14-40 ; xii. 14, 15"! Yes ; but what does the contrast prove ? Was Solomon the first or the last man who in his wiser moments set forth an ideal which he found himself unable or unwilling to attain ? The contrast between the king's life and the king's proverbs (supposing them to be his) would simply set him forth as among the most utterly self-condemned men in all history ; and yet, alas ! this is no unbelievable miracle. Still less conclusive, as it seems to us, is Dr. Cheyne's next remark :

Nor is the moral tone of the "Solomonic" proverbs in its plain *bourgeois* simplicity any more suitable to the name they bear than the religious. Unless Solomon was like Haroun-al-Rashid, and made himself privately acquainted with the ways and thoughts of the citizens, it is difficult to see how he can have written so completely as one of them would have done (p. 131).



Why, it is surely a characteristic of genius to be able to realize a mode of life altogether different from one's own; and, without any "Haroun-al-Rashid" hypothesis, it is perhaps no harder for a monarch to understand a citizen's life than for a poor poet, say, to depict the experiences of a prince.

In considerations like the above, we are bound to say, we do not see sufficient reason for setting aside the tradition of the Solomonic authorship of the Proverbs. Dr. Cheyne has indeed done good service in reminding us of the very composite character of the book. The main body of the work, headed "The Proverbs of Solomon," begins with the tenth chapter and ends with the sixteenth verse of the twenty-second. Between these points every verse or distich contains a separate *mashal*, and without any apparent law of succession or arrangement. Then a section begins with the words, "Incline thine ear, and hear the words of the wise," containing many exhortations of a more continuous character and composed in a more diffuse and rhetorical style. This section ends with chap. xxiv. 22; another then begins with the announcement or title, "There also are sayings of the wise," and continues to the close of the chapter. Another series of proverbs like those of the first collection succeeds, headed by the verse, "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out." This second Solomonic collection (containing several repetitions of proverbs in the earlier parts\*) extends to the end of the twenty-ninth chapter, and is followed by three appendices: "the words of Agur the

\* No fewer than nine proverbs are the same in both collections. See the margin of the Revised Version. Chap. xxv. 24 corresponds with xxi. 9; xxvi. 13 with xxii. 13; xxvi. 15 with xix. 24; xxvi. 22 with xviii. 8; xxvii. 12 with xxii. 3; xxvii. 13 with xx. 16; xxviii. 6 with xix. 1; xxviii. 19 with xii. 11; and xxix. 13 with xxii. 2. There are also several partial coincidences. From these parallels it has been argued that the compiler of the second collection was ignorant of the first. Yet in the first itself there are some repetitions, as xiv. 12 and xvi. 25; x. 1 and xv. 20; x. 2 and xi. 4; xiii. 14 and xiv. 27; xix. 5 and 9; xx. 10 and 23, &c. In general, these repetitions are rather in the manner of an "anthology" than of an original work.



son of Jakeh" (chap. xxx.), "the words of king Lemuel" (xxx. 1-9), both of which are described as "oracles"; the whole concluding with a beautiful anonymous description of the "virtuous woman" (xxx. 10-31)—an acrostic in form, and evidently separate from the rest. The whole book is prefaced by a magnificent poem, the "Praise of Wisdom"—a "glorious little treatise," to use the words of Dr. Cheyne, who adds:

If we ask why an introduction was prefixed, the answer must be that the writer wished to recommend his own inspiring view of practical ethics as a branch of Divine wisdom; in other words, to counteract the sometimes commonplace morality of the earlier proverbs by enveloping the reader in a purer and more ethereal atmosphere. The keynote of the anthology is nothing but Experience; that of the introductory treatise is Divine Teaching. It is a sign of moral progress that the editor of an anthology of Experience should have thought his work only half done till he had prefixed the "Praise of Wisdom" (p. 156).

Very striking is the analysis which Dr. Cheyne gives of this poem, and especially of that crowning passage (Proverbs viii.), in which Wisdom is presented as the firstborn Child of the Creator. We can only quote a sentence or two:

There is no time when we can say that "Wisdom was not." Faith declares that even in that primitive Chaos of which our reason has a horror, the divine Wisdom reigned supreme. The heavenly ocean, the ancient hills, the combination of countless delicate atoms to form the ground, the fixing of the vault of heaven on the world-encircling ocean, the separation of the sea and dry land—all these are later works of God than the Architect through whom He made them. And how did the Architect work? By a "divine improvisation" which allowed no sense of effort or fatigue, and which still continues with unabated freshness. But though her sportive path\* can still be traced in the processes of nature, her highest delight is in the regeneration of the moral life of humanity (p. 160).

\* *Sportive path.* So Dr. Cheyne translates viii. 30, 31. (See also margin R. V.)

"Then was I beside Him as Architect,  
And was daily full of delight,  
Sporting before Him at all times,  
I who (still) have sport with His fruitful earth,  
And have my delight with the sons of men."

One step further would have placed our eloquent expositor in full accord with the ancient exposition of this passage to which he refers, although without direct approval, as an adumbration of the mystery of the Logos.\*

On the whole, a clear case seems to have been made out for the separation of the Book of Proverbs into sections composed, it may be, at long intervals of time. But that the main collection is, at least in its inception, Solomon's, and that universal tradition has rightly placed the Hezekian series also in connection with his great name, we see no reason for doubting. Many a proverb would live in the popular memory long before being committed to permanent record; and very possibly the sayings of successive sages would so group themselves about those of the wise king that their respective authorship would be indistinguishable. We are not, however, disposed, from any evidence hitherto adduced, to surrender the whole tradition; nor can we regard the repeated title "The Proverbs of Solomon," as illusory.† In a word, while fairly open to the light of modern criticism, we still believe in the marvellous endowments assigned

Dr. Cheyne quotes Emerson, "Wood Notes":

"Pleaseth him, the Eternal Child,  
To play his sweet will, glad and wild;"

and Milton (a Hebraist), "Paradise Lost," vii. 10, "didst play;" again, in Tetrachordon, "God Himself conceals not His own recreations."

\* Pp. 161, 162. (The notes in these pages have been misplaced.)

† Dr. Cheyne says (p. 165): "It is indeed a pure hypothesis that any Solomonic element survives in the Book of Proverbs. I doubt not that many bright and witty *sayings* of Solomon came into circulation, and some of them might conceivably have been gathered up and included in the anthologies. But have we any adequate means of deciding which these are? It would appear from 1 Kings iv. 33 that the wisdom of the historical Solomon expressed itself in *spoken* fables or moralizations about animals and trees. A few, a very few, of the proverbs in one book may perhaps satisfy the test thus obtained, and be plausibly represented as a Solomonic element. But why Solomon should be singled out as the author, it would tax one's ingenuity to say, and the judgment of Hitzig (in such matters a conservative critic) must be maintained—that the survival of Solomonic proverbs is no more than a possibility."

to a king so little worthy of them, in that vision at Gibeon when "Jehovah appeared to Solomon in a dream by night, and God said, Ask what I shall give thee."

It is only fair to indicate Canon Cheyne's general conclusions as to the date and origin of the book. The proëm, the "Praise of Wisdom," he inclines to place in the reign of Josiah: its tone, he thinks, befits the general prosperity of that era, and accords with the date of "the composition, or at least promulgation of the Deuteronomic *Tora*." Into the implied conclusion of our author on the Penta-teuchal question we cannot now follow him; we can but indicate our dissent. The first section of the "Proverbs of Solomon" (x. 1.-xxii. 16), he regards as earlier than the proëm. Some of them he would put as early as the ninth century B.C., the complete section in the eighth. That the "men of Hezekiah" compiled the second collection he regards as quite credible. The theory of Vatke and Reuss (the precursors of Kuenen and Wellhausen) that the Proverbs, as a collection, came from the post-Exile period, he cannot accept; although placing in this later era the "Agur" and "Lemuel" sections, on account of their traces of Aramæan and Arabic linguistic influence.

The questions as to the Book of Ecclesiastes are dealt with in a spirit of greater certainty. In this wonderful record of meditation and experience, one of the "Wise men," an "austere and lonely thinker," "living during one of the dreariest parts of the post-Exile period," dwells with bitterness on the sadnesses and disappointments of life, on the violence and oppression of governments, and on the futility of wisdom itself to satisfy the soul. His moralizings, shrewd, melancholy, profound as they often are, only bring into distincter emphasis the *Vanitas vanitatum* which has been the key-note of so many sad and philosophic spirits since those days of Israel's despair. But what of the "conclusion of the whole matter," bright with the gleam of a guiding principle and an assured hope? Alas! this is but an "Epilogue" of later date, inserted by the religious authorities of the time to correct the supposed evil tendency of the rest of the book! The

theory is that of Doederlein, a hundred years ago, followed by Bertholdt, Umbreit, Knobel, and others. That Dr. Cheyne has adopted it proves the boldness of his criticism, indicated also by his suggested rejection of the clause "and the spirit unto God who gave it" (xii. 7). At least, says our critic, if "the Preacher" wrote this, he could not have written the words that immediately follow, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" For Dr. Cheyne finely remarks, "All is *not* vanity, if there is in human nature a point connecting man with that world, most distant and yet most near, where in the highest sense God is." No; but if the wise man who writes is tossed by conflicting feelings, if there are "Two Voices" in his soul,\* might we not expect such diversity, even contradiction, in his utterances?

But the main point for critics is not the settlement of points like these, so much as the determination of the era and the purpose of this wonderful book. It will be seen that in the conclusions we have briefly indicated, there is a great upsetting of views hitherto received by most persons as orthodox. Does not Ecclesiastes, to begin with, claim to be by Solomon? True, Solomon is not mentioned by name. The title simply indicates "Koheleth, the son of David," and the author writes, "I, Koheleth, was king over Israel in Jerusalem." It is, however, undoubtedly probable that Solomon was *meant*; and yet the whole tone of the book is that of an ideal biography. The language and style are in the estimation of most competent Hebraists decisive of a late era. "We could," says Dr. Ginsburg, "as easily believe that Chaucer is the author of *Rasselas*, as that Solomon wrote

\* "Dean Stanley eloquently describes Ecclesiastes as an interchange of voices, higher and lower, within a single human soul. 'It is like the perpetual strophe and antistrophe of Pascal's "*Pensées*.'" But it is more complicated, more entangled, than any of these, in proportion as the circumstances from which it grows are more perplexing, as the character which it represents is vaster and grander and more distracted.' Dr. Plumptre aptly compares the 'Two Voices' of our own poet (strictly, he remarks, there are *three* voices in Ecclesiastes) in which, as in Koheleth, though more decidedly, the voice of faith at last prevails over that of pessimism" (p. 245). Dr. Cheyne, however, thinks that in this view there is overmuch of the "modern spirit."

Koheleth." "If the book of Koheleth be of ancient Solomonic origin," says Delitzsch, "then there is no history of the Hebrew language."\* Dean Plumptre, in his fascinating commentary on Ecclesiastes, and Mr. Tyler in his singularly able and thoughtful work,† may be quoted as sustaining the same conclusions. Ewald "places the date of the book as certainly not before the last century of the Persian monarchy." In fact, the *consensus* is all but universal. It is remarkable, as bearing on the question, that as late as the century before the Christian era there was much debate between the schools of Hillel and of Shammai, as to whether Koheleth might be received into the canon; a discussion, remarks Dean Plumptre, "scarcely conceivable if the book had come down from a remote antiquity with the prestige of Solomonic authorship, and had all along been had in honour as the representative of his divinely inspired wisdom."

If then we are to take this book as representative of one of the later aspects of the *Khochmah*, we may understand it better. Among the "Wise men" of the Jews was "Koheleth"—either "Ecclesiastes, *i.e.*, the Preacher" as the Greek interpreters have it, or the "Great Orator" (Revised Version, *margin*), or the "Debater" (Plumptre), or "an ideal assembly" of the wise (Tyler, who argues acutely from the feminine form of the word), or "one who calls an assembly" (Cheyne). Whatever may be the exact significance of the word, the general sense is plain. "The Koheleth was a wise man" (xii. 9); wise not only with Hebrew wisdom, and with the teachings of sad experience, but with the teachings of Greek philosophy, in the twofold form, Stoic and Epicurean. He lived in an age when these were penetrating the intellectual life of the nations; and when once

\* A list of about one hundred words, forms, or meanings, either peculiar to Ecclesiastes or found only in the late Hebrew or Aramaic, is given by Delitzsch in his commentary on Ecclesiastes (Eng. Ed. Clark, pp. 190-196.

† "Ecclesiastes: a contribution to its interpretation," containing an Introduction to the Book, an Exegetical Analysis, and a Translation with Notes. By THOMAS TYLER, M.A. London, 1874.

we can admit the late authorship of the book, it becomes easy to trace the influence of these two schools of thought. Dean Plumptre, in the imaginary biography of Koheleth which he has prefixed to his commentary, brings him at one part of his career to Alexandria, placing him among the literary and voluptuous associations of that city. The picture of the *Sturm und Drang* period of Koheleth's Alexandrian life, with the inevitable reaction, the *Weltschmerz*, the burden of the universe, the "world set in the heart" (iii. 11), is powerfully painted, with a skilful interweaving of incidents that might have happened, so as to account for the reminiscences and bitter musings of the book.

But it would be unjust to Dr. Cheyne to dwell only on negative criticisms and plausible conjectures. That part of his work devoted to Koheleth is full of delicate and philosophic analysis; expressed in choice, often eloquent terms, with many a flash of light upon the meaning of the author, and with many a criticism, we must also add, which we must hesitate to admit, or must altogether repudiate. The license of textual alteration is still too freely used. Take the following:

Side by side with work, a man should cherish, even to the very last, all those sources of joy which God Himself has provided, remembering the long dark days which await him in Sheôl (xi. 8). Then, at ver. 9, he addresses the young, and in measured distichs entreats them to enjoy life while they may.

"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth,  
And let thy heart gladden thee in the flower of thine age,  
And walk in the ways of thine heart,  
And according to the sight of thine eyes;  
And banish discontent from thy heart,  
And put away evil from thy flesh:—  
For youth and the prime of life are vanity."

Between lines 4 and 5 we find the received text burdened with a prosaic insertion, which is probably not due to an after-thought on the part of the writer, but to the anxiety of later students to rescue the orthodoxy of the book. The insertion consists of the words, Rabbinic in expression as well as thought, "But know that for all this God will bring thee into the judgment." It was the wisdom of true charity to insert them; but it is our wisdom as literary students to "banish discontent" with the discord which they introduce by restoring the passage to its original form (p. 224).

This, to say the least, is overbold. There is absolutely no reason to suspect interpolation, beyond the critic's view of what the passage *ought* to be to express the supposed intention of the author. Those expositors we cannot but think wiser, who accept the words as they are found, and frankly endeavour to interpret them according to the general scope of the book. The attempt is not impossible; as witness Mr. Tyler's paraphrase: "So suitable is enjoyment to youth that he who then rejects pleasure must be looked upon as acting unseasonably (comp. iii. 1-8, 16, 17) and violating the course of nature—conduct for which he may expect to be brought into judgment." For there is a sure retribution of unnecessary or affected asceticism as of excessive or unlawful pleasure. Or else we may take the old Puritan exposition, which regards the call to "rejoice" as grim irony, and lays stress upon the terrible *but* at the end. "The man is bidden to remember, in all the flush of life and joy, that judgment comes at last; if not in man's present stage of being, yet in the great hereafter." Any honest exposition, if one can be given, is better than an arbitrary erasure.

As another point, rather of literary taste than interpretation, illustrating the occasional rashness which meets us in the midst of the Professor's suggestive criticisms, we might instance his strictures on Koheleth's description of old age in the twelfth chapter. We do not forget that to some expositors this is not a picture of life's decline at all, but the description of an on-coming tempest. Adhering, however, on what seems sufficient reason, to the ordinary interpretation, we cannot but be surprised by Dr. Cheyne's refusal to admire the poem. His rendering of it is, in truth, so good that we marvel the more at his taste. But he takes "the risk of being called unimaginative," and we must be content to leave the matter to be settled between him and the great mass of readers.

We have said so much on the Proverbs and Koheleth that we have no space at present to consider Dr. Cheyne's account of that other product, as he considers it, of the Hebrew *Khochmah*, the Book of Job. If in Koheleth we have the



supreme philosopher among the "wise men" who illumined the later Jewish monarchy and the succeeding period of exile, in the author of Job we have the poet of that epoch—a poet unrivalled through all time. Dr. Cheyne has written at large and characteristically on this theme. His conclusions are still often questionable enough, but his learned and eloquent disquisition is fraught with charm.

On the whole, the "higher criticism"—by which must be mainly understood the free and fearless dealing with Scripture on the basis of internal evidence—requires, above all, the guidance of a sound judgment and a reverent mind. Had the former always been exercised, the conclusions of the critics would have been less wildly discordant among themselves: had the latter existed in a becoming degree there would have been perhaps a more cautious dealing with the text of the sacred books. For that they *are* sacred we cannot too carefully keep in mind. Such discussions as those which we have now had before us have to do, and very properly, with the human side of the revelation. The "Wise men," like the historians, the psalmists, the prophets, employed their natural faculties, speaking and writing according to the laws of their own minds, and in their own several styles. But the Divine still uttered itself through the human "at sundry times and in divers manners." No discussion of the Old Testament writings can be held as complete which does not at least search out and endeavour to set forth the traces of Divine influence and teaching. Such books as this of Canon Cheyne deal with phenomena only, and it is certain that no "theory of inspiration" can be rightly constructed apart from a full examination and faithful setting forth of these phenomena. But beyond them we shall learn, if we fully comprehend the position, to recognize a Spirit and a power, which prompted thought and utterance alike, and often led these "Wise men" of Israel to utter truths deeper than they themselves knew, and words which awaited the interpretation of Time. The "Wisdom" celebrated in the Proverbs, and even the dreary heart-cries of the pessimistic Koheleth, were each in their degree "preparations for the gospel." S. G. GREEN.



## CHRISTIANITY AND THE SERVICE OF MAN.

## II.

IN a former paper Mr. Cotter Morison's main critical position was discussed; now we must deal with the other two divisions of his book, his arguments with those who hesitate to renounce Christianity, and his exposition of the substitute he offers.

Men hesitate, he says, for three reasons; they believe that religion has afforded solace and consolation to mortal men, that it has been a stay and support of morality, and that it has been so much the moral force of the past that "a general outbreak of crime and debauchery" would follow its disappearance. And he undertakes to prove that in these respects their belief is groundless.

1. He argues that the consolations of Christianity are more apparent than real; and seeks to prove it by the confessions of sin or of afflictions made by eminent and representative Christians. Not that he has many such to cite; he is too independent of proof to feel the need of adducing evidence. And the process by which he obtains the three or four cases he thinks sufficient; is a very curious one, and very significant of his peculiar critical faculty. Bunyan, for example, is quoted as a type of the Christian his religion has neither pacified nor consoled, but the moment of his life selected is a strange one: it is not taken from the story of his converted life, but from the marvellous piece of autobiography which tells of his struggles to find the way to God, and his stumblings by the way. It is the man as he represents himself in search of peace, not the man at peace, and to use such a moment for such a purpose can only be described as a misuse of history and fact, very remarkable in an elegant *littérateur* who has assumed the rôle of religious thinker and critic. Of Jacqueline Pascal he writes no more fairly, but with quite as much suppression and false emphasis; and of Thomas Boston infamously: "The man would have delighted, one would say, to be a stoker in the infernal regions" (p. 78). "He

evidently gloats and revels in the ideas of wrath, brimstone, fiery strokes, stunning blows, and all the apparatus of his fiery torture chamber" (p. 82). And this is said of one of the tenderest, gentlest, most woman-hearted men, who has written of his love and loss as a father with simple yet touching pathos, and who so loved his people that to save them he would himself have willingly become a castaway. As a "poor Scot" (p. 82), whose theology is indeed not Boston's, yet who belongs to his county and comes of a race which held his name and his work in reverence, I protest against the interpretation both of the man and his system. Our author does not know what the words he quotes mean. If he did, he would feel how they throbbed with an intense passion of pity, yearned with love for men, though also filled with an awful horror of the sin that made the man so hateful to himself that he could not feel how, with this sin, he could ever be acceptable to God. If Mr. Cotter Morison had ever read the theology through the men who believed it, he would never judge the theology as he does. The name of Boston brings back to me the vision of loved, yet long-vanished faces, simple and devout men and women, who loved nature, especially their own storied and classic Tweedside, had the humour that was never so pawky as when it had its quiet laugh at minister or elder, who had, too, the historic sense that made ancient foray and modern event alike familiar and welcome themes, and were of so large an outlook into the ways of Providence and the possibilities of man that their simple speculations seem now to me profounder than much of the philosophy known to the Schools. They thought of God as awful, sovereign, august, yet so righteous in His judgments and so perfect in His justice that no complaint could be made of His ways, however dark and mysterious. They never mistook their own speech, or the speech of the man they admired—the memory of him yet lingers about Ettrick and the Tweed like a sacred presence, or even a tendency that makes for righteousness—but they so understood it as to fear the sin God hated and jealously guard from its defilement the souls God loved. Nor did they know any-

thing of the doctrines of probation and reward which Butler did so much to introduce into theology, so deeply depraving theology by the introduction, but they lived their simple lives dutifully dependent on a God they dared to trust for His mercy and His truth's sake. A faith is one thing when it lives in and for a man; quite another when it has its character and function determined by a sweeping "historic imagination."

The point, as our author states and illustrates it, hardly admits of being argued. His thesis is but a crude paradox, unproved, incapable of proof, untrue alike to history and idea. He has not been able to give it so much verisimilitude or probability as to entitle it to the dignity of disproof. Indeed I would confess that there is a sense in which Christianity does not console men; that consolation is not the highest, or even a high function of religion. A higher is to fill man with a Divine discontent, whether it be in a negative form, as fear of sin, or a positive, as aspiration after holiness; whether it be impatience of all kinds and degrees of tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, or the patient beneficence that loves to be spent in the unwearied service of man. The nobler spirits are not made religious by the need or love of consolation. If that be the motive, a fitter choice than Christianity were Stoicism. It would teach the man calmly to bear evil, to subdue his passions, to regulate his affections, to endure life while happiness is possible, to quit it when it becomes too much for his strength or his peace. But if service be higher than consolation, if an insatiable ambition to be and to do good be esteemed things religious, then history is there to show that Christianity has been a powerful creator of these things. Her choicest creations have been the men and women who loved and lived for humanity, or struggled zealously upwards to attain the similitude of God.

2. The Christian religion is affirmed to be not "really so strong and efficient a support of morality as it is common to suppose" (p. 86).

It is not going too far to say, that the doctrine of all Christians in the final result is antinomian and positively immoral. They do not

only not support and strengthen morality as they claim to do, they deliberately reject and scorn it. They place on a level the most virtuous and the most flagitious conduct, carried on throughout a long lifetime; and this certainly must be held to be putting as great an affront on morality as it is possible to inflict (pp. 92-3).

These are strong sentences, which the author proceeds "to *prove* (the italics are his) by the most authoritative utterances of representative Christian doctors" (p. 93). Who are they? The late Dr. Pusey, St. Alphonso di Liguori, Mr. Spurgeon, Bourdaloue, William Wilberforce, Dr. Ward, Dr. J. A. Moehler, and Canon Liddon. If these be analyzed we find four Roman Catholics, two Anglo-Catholics, one Evangelical, and one Baptist—a curiously assorted, but not extensive gallery of divines, whose "utterances" are mainly of the rhetorical order. That however is a small fault, the process by which they are made to *prove* our author's thesis is a much graver one. Ward and Moehler do not speak for themselves; they are quoted as interpreters of Luther, and their version of his doctrine is set down as if it were his own—a fine proceeding truly, to take ungenerous or unsympathetic enemies as the best authorities for a man's meaning, which is about as reasonable as accepting Mr. Cotter Morison's reading of Christianity for Christ's. And there is as little truth in the result as there is critical accuracy in the process. For Luther is represented as saying, "The object of Christianity is to save men's souls in the next world, not to make them moral in this. And it does save. That is all I want" (p. 172). He would have said nothing of the kind:—an enemy interpreting for polemical purposes a fraction of Luther's mind may say this of him: but he never said it, or would have said of himself. Then, too, the passage from Wilberforce is quoted as if it embodied his view of Christianity, while what it expresses is his regretful statement of what is currently and conventionally, but most incorrectly, thought to constitute a Christian. Spurgeon—certainly a preacher, but as certainly no "Christian doctor" or scientific theologian—is represented by two sermons, which are not interpreted through their end, or in relation to the great

body of his teaching. What claim Alphonso di Liguori's "Glories of Mary" have to be taken as significant of anything but the mythology of the Roman Catholic Church, I for one cannot see. One would have thought that a writer so familiar with the Pascals would not have made any casuist, even though the founder of an order, especially in his ethical teaching, identical even with Catholicism, to say nothing of Christianity.

We may, then, exhibit the precise worth and weight of our author's body of proof thus: "to *prove*" that "the doctrine of *all* Christians is antinomian and positively immoral," he quotes eight writers; and of these two are second-hand interpreters, not scientific historians, but mere blind partizans, whose words are as unveracious as prejudice can make them; three condemn as strongly as possible the very doctrine they are cited to prove; two are egregiously misunderstood, while the Maryolatry of the eighth and last has nothing whatever to do with the religion of Christ.

So much for the proof; now a word or two as to the position: "The doctrine of all Christians in the final result is antinomian and immoral." Can our author ever have read the Sermon on the Mount, the parables and discourses of Jesus, the epistles of Paul, Peter, James, and John? I thought religion had been defined in the New Testament as visiting the widow and fatherless in their affliction, and keeping oneself unspotted from the world;\* while it was no less emphatically taught that Christians were bound to think on and cultivate "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, lovely, and of good report;"† and that their especial beatitude consisted in their being pure in heart, peacemakers, merciful, hungry and thirsting after righteousness.‡ And this position all "representative Christian doctors," even those Mr. Cotter Morison too much despises to know at first hand, have affirmed. Luther maintained that the righteousness of faith was without works, but in order to works. Calvin

\* James i. 27.

† Phil. iv. 8.

‡ Matt. v. 6-9.

defines "*pura germanaque religio*," as "faith joined with serious fear of God," man loving and revering God as his Father, obeying and honouring Him as Master, "*etiamsi nulli essent inferi, solam tamen ejus offensionem horret*;" for only a pure service can satisfy a God who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. John Howe maintains that it is as impossible to repeal the law of nature, with all the virtues it enjoins as that God should be ungodded and man nullified and reduced to nothing. A well-known document defines "man's chief end" as "to glorify God;" and as "glory" and "good" were made coincident in God it followed that the only way in which He could be glorified was by man receiving and being and doing good. The most absolute ethical theory of modern times was the one which made God necessary to its categorical imperative; and the greatest purely speculative work in theology of the past generation was a "*System of Theological Ethics*," which showed that life, as regards moral contents, was in all its forms and ends determined by the idea of God. Indeed, there is nothing so sure and clear as this, that religion has everywhere by Christian teachers been conceived as essentially moral; to conceive it otherwise is to deny it altogether, whether it be by a Roman Maryolater or a polemical positivist.

But wonderful as are our author's positions and methods of proof, his ideas and interpretation of doctrine are more wonderful still. He holds "the doctrine of grace" to be "fatal" to "a systematic culture of morality," because it implies that "at any moment the best men may become the worst" (pp. 113, 114, see also p. 276). That was the very thing it was designed to deny and to disprove, or show to be impossible. The system that made grace most absolute, made the saints most indefectible. So far from expressing the idea of the arbitrary or incalculable, it expressed the very highest ideas of order and absolute law. It was, as it were, the apotheosis of the Divine Will, not indeed as mere will, but as the agent of intelligence regulated and determined by love. To conceive it as absolute was to conceive a realm where chance was not, and where

the laws that reigned were those that governed the nature and determined the ends of God. The man a saint by His grace was a man whose stability and progress in sanctity was assured, for its cause was outside himself in a gracious will whose decrees did not change. And as with "grace," so with "free will:" here indeed our author speaks with even more refreshing simplicity and edifying irrelevance. "Free will is a sort of secular correlative of theological grace" (p. 276). There is a "close analogy, almost amounting to identity, between the doctrines of free will and grace" (p. 277). It is very hard to find out what he means by these sentences, for the words that follow the first sentence imply that the doctrines are mutually exclusive, while the argument that follows the second implies that they are analogous or identical. But on either interpretation his argument fails for want of intelligence. On the first, he does not understand free will; on the second, the relation he affirms to exist is a relation our "most representative Christian doctors" have combined to deny. Taking the first, here is his statement of free will: "It delivers over man, not to the arbitrary inspiration of Divine grace given or withheld, but to the arbitrary autocracy of his own power of volition; which can do with him what it pleases, if it pleases" (p. 277). The first part of this statement is absolutely incorrect; to have an "arbitrary autocracy" of volition is a negation of free will, which as a reasonable will can never be "arbitrary," but can act only for a reason, and, indeed, a sufficient reason. The second part is the negation of the first, and belongs to the speech of determinism, not of freedom. The will that does "what it pleases, if it pleases," is a determined will, governed by the most agreeable, not acting by choice. Taking the second interpretation of grace and free will as analogous and necessary to each other, then the argument is absurdly incorrect. For the "secular correlative of theological grace," which is the reign of law in the Divine action, is not "arbitrary autocracy," but the reign of law in the realm of the will, or the sphere of human action. And this has often been conceived, incorrectly as I believe, to involve determinism. Has our author never heard



of a certain famous Edwardean Treatise on the "Freedom of the Will"? Let him study it and in connection with another Edwardean dissertation on "The End for which God created the World;" and he will find himself face to face with a determinism which has as its ultimate basis a very absolute doctrine of grace; and yet beside it his own will seem a shallow and diluted thing. If a man undertakes to refute religion, he ought not to consider it beneath him to be correct; if he does, then the cure for him is not argument but knowledge. Yet how to cure the complex ignorance of this book is a problem hard indeed to answer.

2. The chapter on "Morality in the Ages of Faith" need not be examined, it is simply a study in Ecclesiastical Pathology, illustrated by much illicit anecdotage, without any bearing on the ostensible thesis of the book. The chapter on "What Christianity has Done" offers even more than the usual superabundant material for animadversion and correction. He laments that "such illustrious men as Strauss, F. C. Baur, Keim, Hausrath, and Renan," have not sufficiently attended to "the precise time and place in the order of human evolution in which the (Christian) religion arose" (p. 173). Now, I would say, this was the very thing they did attend to; without it their criticism had no *point d'appui*. It is the point Baur emphasizes in the opening of his *Kirchengeschichte*, and to it several of his most important *Abhandlungen* are devoted. Keim has a book occupied with its most important phase; and Renan has dwelt eloquently on its more significant aspects. It is indeed a very old theme, as old as Church history or even the earliest apologetic. Further, he holds that "the political action of Christianity" has been bad, because in the struggles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries "the Christian Church threw its whole weight on the side of oppression" (pp. 186-7). Churches did, Christianity did not: religion supplied at once the motives and the ideals of the struggle for freedom in England and the Netherlands. The great modern vindications of tyranny and intolerance have come from the side not of faith, but of unbelief. To find passive obedience in Paul is to misread him utterly; no man



ever more resolutely resisted arbitrary power or showed more successfully why it ought to be done. But as our last signal example of the man and his manner we give this description of the old Christian attitude to life and its sufferings.

Earthly miseries, famines, pestilences, ignorance, chronic poverty, were lamentable, no doubt; but the famines and the pestilences were especially so, as manifestations of God's wrath, who was thus chastising a wicked world. Their proper and only antidote was prayer, and repentance, and humiliation before God, who might thereby be induced to stay his hand. Such afflictions were incidental to the lot of man, the appropriate retribution for sin, to be borne with resignation. As for combating them by human means and knowledge, with a view to suppressing them, if such an idea could have emerged, it would have been unquestionably pronounced impious and shocking (p. 256).

Nothing more cruelly ungenerous could well have been written. No doubt, the special time he has in view is what he so perversely mis-names "the Ages of Faith;" but he makes no limit or qualification, speaks of the one he describes as the normal and historical Christian attitude to disease and misery. Yet he might have remembered the new spirit Christianity brought into the world—how it loved and helped the poor, visited the sick and the prisoner, built the hospital, made in the day of pestilence its matrons and its virgins nurses, and its churches the homes of the stricken and the forsaken, used the first hour of civil strength to suppress the amphitheatre, and all its higher agencies to lighten the horrors that followed the decline and death of the ancient civilization. Recognition of her beneficence Christianity begs from no man's mercy; historical truth demands it for her as her indefeasible right.

We have done. To speak severely of a book is never a pleasant task, and it is never so unpleasant as when its writer is known to have peculiar claims on our sympathy and forbearance; but when it is an imperative duty to speak plain truth in plain terms, it must be spoken. It has been to me something of a personal humiliation to notice this book, or to feel that educated people have so spoken of it as to make a review of it necessary. No one can be in-

sensible to its occasional literary charm, its vivid, now caustic, now tender, portraiture: but a book on a great theme ought to be a serious book, with a passion for truth, for accuracy, for thoroughness, for justice, honest enough to spare no labour or pains to understand in their real purpose and meaning the system and the men opposed, magnanimous enough to say the best that can be said concerning them. Of these qualities there is no trace here—traces indeed of qualities very much their opposite; and no essay can contribute to the religion of the future which is unjust to the religion of the past. Truth is our common interest; to find it ought to be our common ambition and endeavour; but so long as men take pains to be unfair to persons, and do not scrupulously labour to be just to causes, truth will never be found. I will not follow Mr. Cotter Morison into his account of “the Service of Man,” because I cannot allow that he has earned the right to treat of it by rightly treating “the Service of God.” The two are not opposed or antithetical, but one and identical. There can be nothing more absolutely alien to the spirit of Christ than a service of God without any service of man; nay, such a service He declared impossible, and pronounced the attempt at it as worst impiety, deserving utter condemnation: “Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto Me.” If our author had so studied as to understand the faith he so glibly criticises, he would have come to know that the religion which rose as love to God and love to man, has never allowed that God was either loved or served where man was hated or unblessed.

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

---

## FIRST REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMISSION.

### II.

THE following examination of Rev. J. Duncan brings out some very important points in relation to the character and management of the National School Society.

10,816. (*Mr. Richard.*) You gave us the amount raised by voluntary efforts in connexion with your Society that

had been spent in building and maintaining both schools and training colleges, from 1811 to 1870, and from 1870 to the present time; could you give us the amount which has been contributed for the same objects during the same time out of public sources?—I have not got it at hand; it is of course deducible from the Government returns.

10,817. Would it be possible to have those returns?—Yes.

10,818. You have been asked some questions as to the possibility of having a system of united secular and separate religious instruction; you do not think it is practicable?—No, I do not.

10,819. There have been two modes suggested, one by the Bishop of London and one by Dr. Rigg; the former is to train teachers specially to give the religious instruction, and the other is to make arrangements by which the ministers of different religious bodies might have access to the schools to give such instruction; do you not think that the latter suggestion is practicable?—No, I do not.

10,820. But do not Christian churches exist expressly for the purpose of teaching religion to the people?—Yes.

10,821. And are not the children of the people the most important element in the population?—Yes.

10,822. Do not Christian churches rather abdicate their own function in regard to what is one great end of their existence when they refuse and say: "We cannot take charge of the religious education of the children of our flock; we are not competent; we have no time; and we must wash our hands of all responsibility?"—By no means; I do not think that follows. It is not my idea that the clergy should abdicate, or should wish to abdicate, but merely that they cannot do the work so well for the children in school or after school hours. No doubt the clergy have an opportunity of doing kindred work on Sundays, and in evening classes, and in classes of various kinds where they can do it more effectually.

10,823. Do you mean to say that the clergy are not so competent to teach religion as the schoolmasters?—I think that there is much in the way of religious training that the clergy can do far better. They can exercise influence, and

they can test religious instruction and stimulate the teachers, and many of them can give the teaching itself extremely well; but any one who knows anything about school teaching knows how much training has to do with giving it efficiently.

10,824. But the clergy are trained in some sense to give religious instruction?—They are trained to teach, certainly, but they are not trained to teach classes of children.

10,825. You are aware, I daresay, that the system which was introduced many years ago as the national system in Ireland by the late Lord Derby, who was himself a very earnestly religious man, was upon these lines—united secular and separate religious instruction?—So I understand; but I have no knowledge of the Irish system.

10,826. You are, perhaps, aware that there was a very important declaration published (I forget the exact date) and signed by 2,750 members of the united churches of England and Ireland, in support of that system. Their signatures comprised the Lord Primate of Ireland, a lord justice of appeal, 45 noblemen, six bishops, 146 deputy lieutenants, and so on; and they say: "We, the undersigned members of the united churches of England and Ireland, desire to express our earnest hope that the principle of united secular education, as opposed to the denominational system, may be maintained in Ireland. Without pledging ourselves to an approval of the national system in all respects, we entirely admit the justice of a policy which protects scholars from interference with their religious principles, and thus enables the members of different denominations to receive together in harmony and peace the benefits of a good education."

10,827. Am I wrong in assuming that one great object of your Society is to support the Church of England?—That is not the view of it that I should take at all. My view is that the supporters of the National Society consider it a very important duty to give religious instruction in their own belief to children of their own poor. Their wish is to benefit the children.

10,828. But was not one of the primary motives which

led to the establishment of the National Society a feeling of emulation, and perhaps I may say of alarm, at the spread of what are called the Lancastrian schools?—I am not aware of it.

10,829. Are you acquainted with Dr. Southey's life of Dr. Bell?—I have not read Dr. Southey's life of Dr. Bell.

10,830. Dr. Bell was the founder, to a large extent, of your Society, was he not?—He organised the methods, but he was not the founder of the Society.

10,831. You have not met, then, with this sentence in a letter of his published in his life: "It cannot be dissembled that thousands in various parts of the kingdom are drawn from the Church by the superior attention paid to education out of the Church, and I shall never cease," he goes on, "to repeat that I know of but one effectual way to check those efforts" (that is the Lancastrian schools) "and it is by able and well-directed efforts of our own hands." That seems to imply that it was started in part for the purpose of supporting the Church of England?—I take it of course that the Church of England has a duty to its own poor that an undenominational body could not discharge.

10,832. There is a monthly paper issued by your Society, I think?—No; there is a weekly paper.

10,833. Did not this sentiment appear in that periodical some time ago: "In the present condition of Church schools it is more than ever necessary that they should be made nurseries for Church principles, and that the whole schooling of a child should gradually lead up to this. They ought to know why they should be Churchmen and not Dissenters, why they should go to church and not to meeting, why they should be Anglicans and not Romanists?"—But the National Society is not responsible for everything that is said in that paper. That is the opinion of the individual writer. I am not saying whether the writer is right or wrong, but merely stating a fact.

10,834. You do not agree with that view, then?—I should not express my own view in that way.

10,835. There was no conscience clause, I think, according to the original constitution of your Society?—Originally there was no conscience clause.

10,836. All the children who attended the schools were expected to learn the Church Catechism and to attend church on Sundays, were they not?—So far as I know, the question was never raised in the early days of the Society; children came as a matter of course, and they learnt the Catechism as a matter of course. It was after difficulties were raised, and after a good deal of controversy, that the conscience clause was accepted.

10,837. But all the children in their schools were expected to learn the Church Catechism, I suppose?—They were expected to do so, no doubt. I cannot of course speak from knowledge of those early days. I imagine that it was supposed that when they went to the school they would take part in the religious instruction of the school.

10,838. But were not these among the principles laid down for the schools: that the children were to be instructed in the Holy Scriptures, and the Liturgy and the Catechism of the Church of England, and to be assembled for the purpose of attending service in the parish church, and the masters and mistresses to be members of the Church of England?—Certainly; those are the principles of the Society.

10,839. When was the conscience clause introduced?—What is called the time-table conscience clause was introduced in the Education Act of 1870, and it is binding upon every school which receives a grant from Government.

10,840. But you have not now what is called the Cowper-Temple clause, which forbids the use of denominational catechisms?—That applies to board schools and not to denominational schools.

10,841. In a great many places in the country the only school existing is a denominational school, is it not?—In a great many places it is.

10,842. In that case there is power now under the new law to compel children belonging to parents of all denominations to attend such schools, and if they receive any

religious instruction at all they must receive it through the medium of the Catechism and formularies taught in that school, must they not?—If they receive it in the school, certainly. They can, of course, take advantage of the conscience clause.

10,843. The time-table conscience clause?—Yes.

10,844. Is it not the case that there are a great many Nonconformists, especially of the minor Methodist bodies, in those agricultural and sparsely populated districts, where nothing but denominational schools exist?—There are Nonconformists, no doubt.

10,845. Then is any provision made to meet such a case as that?—They can obtain the advantage of the conscience clause.

10,846. But if the parents do not urge that plea, do the teachers make any inquiry as to whether they are Nonconformists or not?—The teachers naturally do not ask them to take advantage of the conscience clause, but the conscience clause is hung on the wall of the school for all to see.

10,847. But my point is this: whether there ought not to be a conscience clause for the teachers, because if they teach the Church Catechism to Nonconformists, they teach little children to repeat what is false, because you know that in the Church Catechism there is reference to baptism as being at the foundation of Christian life, and there are large bodies of Nonconformists who do not baptise their children; and to make little Baptist children repeat that, would be to make them repeat a falsehood, would it not?—It is a difficulty that has never occurred to me, but I should imagine that any sensible teacher, if such a case arose, would simply pass over that question in the case of Baptist children.

Dr. Rigg and the Wesleyan friends of Denominational Education cannot have been particularly pleased with Mr. Lyulph Stanley's very keen and searching examination as to the Wesleyan Schools.

7250. (*Mr. Lyulph Stanley.*) I want to put one or two



questions as to your numbers ; you have referred to your table of Sunday schools with 862,000 children in them. but we should take off 200,000 of those as children over the elementary age, should we not?—You must take off those.

7251. On the other hand, you mentioned the number of children under seven years of age, but the children do not go to Sunday school so young as they do to week day schools ; they do not go under five years of age, do they?—That would depend very much upon the locality ; many schools have children's classes where they take very small children indeed, and it must be so when you consider that 200,000 of them are under seven years of age.

7252. May we take it roughly that there are something like 600,000 of the Sunday school children who are children of the age that they could go to day schools?—Yes, about that number.

7253. And you have about 160,000 in the Wesleyan day schools?—Yes.

7254. Of those roughly half would not be Wesleyans?—Half you may say would not be Wesleyans.

7255. Therefore you have 80,000 Wesleyan children under instruction in the Wesleyan day schools?—Those are calculations which I should hardly like to be bound by.

7256. But taking it roughly, out of your 600,000 Sunday scholars, you would not have more than 100,000 who are Wesleyans?—Roughly, about that.

7257. (*Dr. Rigg.*) But is not the number 180,000?—Yes.

7258. (*Mr. Lyulph Stanley.*) Have you 180,000 upon the roll?—178,000 odd. It is given in the Blue Book as 172,000, but ours is the complete official account for our denomination.

7259. Taking it roughly that about 100,000 in the day schools may be Wesleyans, therefore you would have roughly about half of all your Wesleyan children educated in other than Wesleyan day schools?—Yes, roughly, if we are to call all the children gathered into the Sunday schools Wesleyan children, but it does not follow that they are the children of members of the church, or that they are the



children of persons connected with us at all. The Sunday school in many cases is a mission.

7260. I was not drawing a technical distinction between members of the church and adherents?—My point was that it must not be forgotten that many of those attending the Sunday school have no connexion with Wesleyanism, except being brought into the Sunday school.

7261. But we may take it that they are the children of parents who have a larger sympathy with Wesleyanism than with any other form of religion?—It may be so. I should say that as regards a child gathered into a Wesleyan Sunday school its parents would necessarily be in sympathy with the church which has gathered in the child.

7262. The very large majority of persons in sympathy with Wesleyanism are having their children instructed in Wesleyan schools?—Yes, and in British schools.

7263. In Board schools, British schools, and Church schools?—Where a British school exists I should say they are rather in a British school than in a Church school.

7264. But the effect of the denominational system is to secure to the masses of Wesleyans instruction in a denominational school other than their own?—I should say that the effect of the denominational system is that it gives the Wesleyans the opportunity of bringing instruction to the children belonging to their own body.

7265. Any little re-adjustment would not make a material difference?—We might amend the figures, but still the figures will not be likely to affect the existence of schools in various parts of the country under the Wesleyans, or what the effect has been found to be in the way of the good results of those schools.

7266. I was merely asking whether the effect of denominational schools is not, as a rule, to secure the education of Wesleyan children under denominational influences different from those of Wesleyans?—To a considerable extent, and Wesleyans as such, as far as I know, have no conscientious objection to that.

7267. I have not asked you that; I was trying to get facts from you?—What I have now stated is a fact.

## MISS EDNA LYALL'S NEW STORY.\*

MISS EDNA LYALL had made a reputation before the stories which constitute her principal title to fame fell into our hands. At the recommendation of a friend we read "Donovan" and "We Two," and we felt at once that a new writer of considerable power, and, what is of more importance, of very true religious spirit and noble purpose had arisen amongst us. The new book which is before us more than confirms the most favourable opinion we had formed. Without losing any of the freshness of spirit and intense enthusiasm which gave such character to her earlier books, Miss Lyall has gained much by experience. Her style has become more easy, her command of her subject more thorough, her skill both in the invention and in the working out of her plot more perfect. As a mere story "Knight Errant" is entitled to take high rank. It is written in a graceful and flowing style which rarely if ever falls below its own high level. We are led on from point to point in very simple and natural fashion, and it is only when we reach the end and look back on the road we have travelled together, that we understand with what art the plan has been laid out, and how each successive step has contributed to the general effect. But it is not as a clever and interesting tale only that this book is to be judged. In truth, it is not easy to classify it. To talk of it as a novel with a purpose would be unfair, since that would suggest long and prosy conversations and incidents introduced simply with a view of bringing out certain ideas or principles of the author's with but little of the coherence and interest attaching to a well-conceived and well-developed plot. It is certainly a religious novel, and yet it is as different from the general run of books which answer to this description as it would be easy to conceive. It has, in the first place, a literary finish in which they are too often lacking, and its object is to tell the story of a life inspired by the true religious sentiment and motive not to inculcate some

\* *Knight Errant*. By EDNA LYALL. Three Vols. (Hurst and Blackett.)

doctrinal theory or fan the zeal for an ecclesiastical system. For the cant of schools or parties our authoress has a special contempt, and there is not an approach to it to be found in these volumes. Whether now and then she may not be betrayed into a cant of her own, or what comes perilously near it, we will not pretend to say. But take it as a whole, there is a reality in the book as well as a marked robustness of thought which ought not only to secure respectful attention to the writer, but to awaken a certain measure of sympathy for her views. We differ from her on some important points, but none the less do we recognize her as a fellow-worker in the religious education of men, and fully appreciate the important influence which a story of this kind must exert. Those who come to "Knight Errant" for amusement will find even that, for it is a tale of remarkable originality and well-sustained interest, but it will be their own fault if they do not find in it something much more solid and valuable. We admire the independence of thought, the freedom from narrow conventionalism, the artistic skill shown in the delineation of character, the power of Miss Lyall as a story-teller. But we admire still more the sympathetic temper in which the whole is written, the remarkable insight shown into the difficulties and temptations of various orders of mind, the strong faith in right and the passionate love of goodness which is breathed everywhere.

In "Donovan" and "We Two" Miss Edna Lyall undertook one of the most difficult of tasks to rebuke and correct the ordinary mode of treating unbelievers. It is a common idea that they may properly be regarded as outcasts, and dealt with accordingly. They are the enemies of God, and it is quite proper that we should look upon them as ours also, and mete out to them some of the indignation and punishment they deserve. "Ah," said a Christian professor to us on one occasion, "I don't pretend to be much myself, but I can't stand these atheists." It seemed as though the worthy man's idea was that in some way or other he compensated for his own religious deficiencies by his severity towards unbelievers. This is the spirit which is held up

to examination and reprobation in the two books we have mentioned, and in contrast with it is presented the sympathetic spirit of a more Christlike Christianity. The effect of the former is to make infidels, and infidels of a fiery and uncompromising temper, the effect of the latter to win back some who may have already gone astray from the fold. We do not profess to endorse all that is said in working out this idea. It is the idea itself which we accept, and we feel extremely grateful to the writer for presenting it in a form so attractive. Both these books are works of art which have a value independent of the lessons they convey, but it is this high teaching, this protest against narrowness and bigotry, this telling reminder that if men are to be converted to the obedience of faith they must see in life, not in mere doctrine, that which constitutes the principal charm in our estimation.

In "Knight Errant" Miss Lyall's task is even more difficult, and her success in her character as a religious teacher is much more doubtful. The leading principle of the book may be gathered from the motto on the title-page taken from Dr. Walter C. Smith's "Olrig Grange"—

But all through life I see a Cross  
Where sons of God yield up their breath;  
There is no gain except by loss;  
There is no life except by death,  
There is no vision but by Faith,  
Nor glory but by bearing shame,  
Nor justice but by taking blame,  
And that Eternal Passion saith,  
"Be emptied of glory and right and name."

The story is, in fact, a story of cross-bearing, and of cross-bearing as many of our readers will say of a very singular kind. When the story opens the hero has just been called to the Italian bar, and has before him every prospect of a large practice and honourable distinction. The day of his call to the bar was also the day of his betrothal to a young English girl to whom he was intensely attached, but just when his sky was the brightest a cloud of singular blackness came over it. His sister, who had disgraced her family

by eloping with the manager of an operatic company, suddenly returns to Naples, greatly to the dismay of the young man and his mother, the latter of whom collapsed under the shock. The young Carlo thus found himself charged with a sister who was an opera singer, and whose character was already compromised. He feels that his only hope of saving her is by joining the company as a singer himself. The position is open to him, and his success as a great baritone is assured, but if he is to take this course he must not only sacrifice a profession for which he is eminently qualified, but give up all hope of inheriting his uncle's property, and what is worse, break off his engagement with the young girl of whom he was passionately fond. All this he does under the idea that this is the true way of leading the highest Christian life. The story of his internal struggle, or rather struggles (for the conflict was renewed again and again) is told with remarkable power. His mind was set thinking by an incidental observation which he overheard in a conversation: "Men are not more willing to live the life of the Crucified." "What," he asks, in one of his heart-agonies, "was the life of the Crucified?" and the answer shaped itself to his mind something after the following fashion:

The life of the Crucified was lived by One who delighted to do God's will. He did not exclude pleasure or morbidly delight in pain; it was just that He did not think about pleasing Himself at all. He took the bitter and the sweet as they were sent, and delighted in them because He knew the Sender who sought only the good of all men. This is the life of the Crucified. You think happiness is to please yourself—it is not that at all; it is to delight in doing His will. "Lord," he sobbed, "I am not willing—it is true I am not willing to live Thy life. Save me from my selfishness! By Thine agony and bloody sweat, by Thy cross and passion, good Lord, deliver me."

The idea is certainly a new and a curious one—a man taking up his cross by becoming a great baritone singer. Of course one of the writer's objects is to deprecate the judgment of a large number of Christian people in relation to the stage—in short, to do for the actor what she had previously done for the unbeliever. The views are put in the most

extreme form in a sermon preached in a parish church by a clergyman who was ignorant that his own son, who had gone on to the stage, was among those who listened to his terrible denunciations of the theatre and the actors. To such indiscriminating and unwise attacks it is very easy to reply; in fact, they defeat themselves in virtue of their own violence. To adopt the expressions of the old Puritans in relation to the stage, and not only so, but to give them in exaggerated form, is worse than foolish, for it creates a sense of injustice which always tells in favour of its supposed victims. For it is hardly to be denied that the Puritans had to deal with a very different condition of things from that which meets us to-day. At the same time, a preacher may surely instruct his people in his own views of the theatre without being liable to the kind of reflections which we find here. "This particular Midianite began to wonder whether, if he from the stage had begged people to shun the church and to refrain from giving at the offertory, the preacher would not have denounced him as a man who wilfully robbed another of his daily bread."

The whole question of the relations of Christian men to the theatre is one of the most important in the region of Christian ethics. There are still those who hold that a visit to a theatre is a sin of very heinous character, as bad if not worse than telling a lie. They have a severe code of Christian life which consists mainly of restrictions in matters which for the most part are indifferent. Of course the code is elastic, and is largely shaped by the tastes of the individuals. "The line must be drawn somewhere" was once a familiar expression, and it was generally so drawn by individuals as to include that "which they were inclined to" and to ban that "which they'd no mind to." It would be untrue to say that these new commandments took the place of the moral law, but there was too strong a tendency to regard obedience to them as a sign of grace and to relegate moral virtues to a subordinate position as attainments possible even to a man of the world. This type of character has not altogether ceased from among us. Of course it has many varieties due to the influence of indivi-

dual temper and a man's general surroundings. Our authoress has not given us the worst examples. Even the clergyman who indulged in the unwise tirade of which we have spoken was under the influence of a sorrow which might well disturb his judgment, and was found to have underneath this apparent severity great tenderness of heart. The following sketch is very true to nature, and gives a fair idea of a class which, if it is narrow and possibly Pharisaic, has many virtues :

Kate Britton was an indefatigable worker; parish work was her delight, and to her mind the luckless wight who did not go district visiting, who was not an ardent teetotaler, who could not show a well-ordered Sunday-school class as the visible fruits of persevering work, hardly deserved toleration. Like all workers who are worth much she was full of enthusiasm, and would have been greatly missed in the village; but she was "ill to live with," because she had not yet learnt to see things from any point of view but her own, and had an overweening idea of her own importance. Carlo Donati was just now much on her mind; she had a feeling that he must have been brought to Merlebank for some special purpose; and as it was Kate's way to think always of the impression she might make on others, rather than of the impressions she might receive from them, she began to consider how she could bring her influence to bear on the Italian, and her enthusiasm was roused by an idea which came to her one day as she mused over his life. What a glorious thing it would be if she could convince him that he was leading a life unworthy of a true man, and induce him to give up his profession! . . . The morning-room was a bright, sunny, cheerful room, facing south, and Carlo enjoyed his change of quarters very much; he was glad to see Kate, too, for she interested him, and he delighted in tracing the slight likeness to Francesca which he had noticed when he first came to Merlebank. Kate, who was inordinately self-conscious, quickly perceived that his eyes followed her as she moved about the room arranging flowers in the vases, and she felt provoked, for it would be so horribly like a story-book if the invalid were to fall in love with her; yet she could not snub him as she snubbed the curate, because she wanted to influence him for his good, and longed for the honour and glory of persuading him to quit the stage. Reflecting that this was the Monday in Holy Week, she thought she would supply him with suitable literature—at any rate, the offer of books would make a good opening for conversation. So she began boldly, yet with an effort that surprised her; somehow, although she had astonishing theories as to the universal depravity of young men, she had an undefined consciousness that Carlo Donati was not so immeasurably beneath her as the curates and the men to be met with at dances and tennis-parties. This perception did not please her.



With people of this order, however, it is useless to argue. Kate Britton had fine elements of character, and when events taught her the unfairness of her judgments was honourable enough to alter them. But this is not a common case. For the most part, those who hold such views are clothed in an armour which it is not easy to penetrate. But though it may be easy to demonstrate the absurdity of their extreme position, that does not end the controversy. There are numbers who would laugh to scorn the notion of placing a visit to the theatre in the same category as a lie, or a breach of trust, or even a piece of malicious scandal, who, nevertheless, are not satisfied that Christians do wisely in countenancing the theatre. They have no objection to dramatic representation; they do not believe all actors and actresses to be sinners beyond all others; they do not suppose that there must be moral contamination in a visit to the play; they cast no doubt on the piety of many whom the idea of evil has never occurred. It is with them a matter of Christian expediency in the broadest sense, that is, of the influence of the stage upon themselves and others. Not to refer to other points, they have strong feelings as to the effect upon the performers of the life they are compelled to lead, and especially upon those in the lower ranks. Great actors or singers no doubt have a busy life, for artistic excellence of any kind is not to be attained without continuous effort. But this cannot be said in relation to a large number who are necessary to the work of the theatre. Theirs must be to a large extent an idle, loafing, lounging life, and those who feel that they have a responsibility for their fellow men may well hesitate as to countenancing a system which compels this. To objections of this order Miss Lyall gives no answer. Indeed, her representations of life behind the scenes go far to strengthen objections of this kind. There are some fine characters depicted here, and we should be the very last to doubt that they may have their counterparts in dramatic society. But despite our author's skill in making the best of her materials, we cannot say that we have found association with this operatic company either very pleasant or very profitable.



Sardoni, who was one of the best of them, and from the first proved himself the friend of the young man whom unfortunate circumstances had thrown into their ranks, had been driven to the stage by his own early follies and sins. The fact that youths of this stamp, who cannot give themselves to the serious business of life, and mere loafers if they are nothing worse, look to the stage as a means of support, partially accounts for the prejudice which exists against it in other circles beside those which can fairly be regarded as Puritan. We never met a sober-minded parent who could contemplate with anything approaching complacency the idea of his son becoming an actor, while the prospect of a daughter becoming an actress would be regarded with absolute dismay and horror by numbers who are in the habit of frequenting the theatre themselves. We doubt whether this book will at all remove or diminish the impression. The "knight errant" was a successful singer, but his life in the company was nothing better than a martyrdom.

We cannot attempt to deal with our author's theological ideas, which, in truth, are not developed with sufficient clearness to allow of their being criticized. Her aim is to glorify Christian living, and in this we are one with her. But at the back of such a life of struggle and sacrifice as that which she depicts, there must be strong and intelligent faith. Far be it from us to suggest that our authoress is insensible to that, but, in reading some portions of the story, we have had a feeling that its hero is too much under the power of impulse instead of strong principle. We make the objection with hesitation, since it would be folly to judge a story as though it were a theological treatise. Mrs. Lyall is evidently anxious to give our religion a brighter character. The following sketch is very clever and suggestive. It is a picture of an English Sunday.

"They don't seem to know how to enjoy," said Carlo, feeling quite oppressed, as foreigners always do by the extreme quiet. "Ah, here comes a band, that makes it a little more lively! *Guisto cielo!* What is this? A revolutionary club? See! they have 'Blood and Fire' on their banner, that's rather too strong." "That, my dear Valentino,

is the pet abomination of the true respectable Briton—it is the Salvation Army, a band of religious workers." "They will at any rate rouse up the sleepers," said Carlo, laughing. "They make it seem a little less like a city stricken with the plague, I must say. It is cool to criticize your national customs after being here so short a time; but really your Sunday does seem rather too drowsy-respectable; it has little of the Festa about it." "That all depends on your definition of a Festa," said Sardoni. "The average Briton, who has been religiously brought up, goes to church morning and evening, eats a heavier dinner than usual in the middle of the day for the sake of sparing his servants, abuses the Salvation Army for disturbing the Sabbatical calm, and nods serenely through the afternoon over a volume of sermons." "They read sermons to themselves, do you mean, besides hearing two in the churches?" asked Carlo, with an air of such ingenuous astonishment that Sardoni burst into a laugh. "Why, yes, to be sure, many of them wouldn't think it Sunday without," he replied. "Poor things! poor things!" said Carlo, with a pity which to the Englishman was highly comic.

There is truth in the satire, to which we should do well to give heed, but it may easily be pressed so far as to interfere with much that is sacred. We cannot afford to have our Sundays laughed away.

With all our admiration, and it is not small, for Miss Lyall, and our approval of many elements in her teaching, we cannot but feel that she has got a one-sided view of a certain religious school and their practices which requires some modification. If she could set herself to study Evangelicals and Puritans in the same spirit which she has shown either to the unbeliever or the actor, and then set herself to write a book which should bring out their best points and correct the faults of their enemies as she has done for Donovan and Carlo Donati, she would do a valuable and not unnecessary service. The tide has for some time been setting quite strongly enough against them. The time has come when some check might wisely be put upon it.

---

## THE CONVERTING POWER IN THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.\*

It would be difficult to answer all the questions which suggest themselves in reference to this subject. We cannot tell whether conversions are more frequent, or less frequent, than they once were in the congregations of our faith and order. We cannot tell whether the changed method of putting gospel truth which marks our time, has been injurious or beneficial to the growth of our churches. At least to such questions as these, if once started, many and diverse answers could be given—all having many grains of truth in them.

But we can and do agree that we should all like to see more conversions under our ministry. And it is possible that some of us would advance further and say, that could we make certain changes in ourselves and in our methods of working on the souls of men, we for our own part should certainly be more successful in this matter.

Perhaps there are none who would say that our own most cherished hopes are being realized, and that our deepest desires are being fulfilled. It seems, therefore, that we can all occupy common and practical ground for the consideration of such a subject. And certainly for myself I would desire to take the lowest place, and would only put my thoughts before you as inquiries whose urgency and solemnity I would fain feel apply to myself more than to those who have so graciously asked me to speak.

The whole of this day's conference is concerned with a desire on our part, deepening as we come closer together, for greater power to be useful as God's agents to men. And this subject turns on the same pivot. It is an inquiry as to whether our service is powerful, whether it is effective ; and effective in one special and most serious direction. With mingled gratitude and shame we feel our need of this self-questioning. If pursued with this mingled feeling—of praise for what Christ has done by us, of humiliation for what we have failed to do because of our unfaithfulness,

\* Read at a Conference of Ministers at Liverpool, January 18, 1887.

the inquiry will be a wholesome one. It is enough, perhaps, that the mind should be set thinking—that the thoughts and fears and hopes of the soul should be sent in this direction. There are in every household some drawers or cupboards that need to be set straight. And an overhaul of our purposes about converting people would surely lead in itself to fresh effectiveness on our part. Things loose and disarranged and unmethodical would be set in order. After the order would come burning desire. “While I was musing the fire burned.”

At a college committee, a young candidate for the ministry read a sermon, and one of the committee asked him the very pertinent question: “What did you intend to do with that sermon?” To *do*. Sermons and pastoral visitations are to do something. Is it enough to write our discourse fully out, to deliver it effectively? Is it enough to pay our call, and pass a few pleasant minutes in the homes of our people? What did we intend to *do*? When the sharp-shooter lifts his gun to shoulder, he intends to let the bullet take effect! When the vine-dresser wipes away the insects and nips off the fading leaves and raises a drooping bunch of grapes, he intends his labour to be of some account! Our labour is spiritual; but it is all the more real. We fight with principalities; all the more reason is there that we should overcome them. We preach to immortal souls: how pressing then the necessity of asking whether we help to make their immortality worth having.

This throwing back of our minds on the primary purposes of our ministry is all the more urgent because of the constant temptation to which we are exposed of professionalism. A lady lately wrote to me: “I was sorry for my own sake to have been out when you called, but I am sure that you had no reason to be sorry, for it was one more call off your mind!” It was a way of putting things that made one wince. All the more so as it hit in the bull’s-eye the prevailing temptation incident to our vocation. To attend so many committees, to pay so many pastoral visits, to preach so many sermons measured by the clock and not by the heart, to have written so many letters, all this shows a busy life. But after all, what have we *done*!

The interruptions to our own purposes and plans are often the putting again into our hands the main purpose of our life. We are interrupted by a child, but a child is of more importance than the magazine we were just cutting. We are interrupted by a poor woman, but her tale of sorrow is of vaster moment than the well-rounded paragraph we were just penning. We were hastening home tired after our Sunday's work, we were interrupted by a young man in perplexity; and lo we found that our Sunday's real work had not yet been truly touched. We had to begin our day's work like Jesus with Nicodemus, by night. Souls, men, women, children: these we are sent to hunt and to catch. And yet how often when they come sailing into our net, we are so busy mending the fine meshes of our net that we refuse to take them. And thus what we have to show is another book read, but another opportunity lost; another sermon finished, but another soul left untouched. It is we who have interrupted God: not God who has interrupted us. Interruptions!

This turning in upon ourselves to see whether we still hold the main line of purpose, may be profitably accomplished occasionally by special reading. For direct and searching power, there are no writings comparable to the Pastoral Epistles. What better Monday morning tonic could we take than Paul's Epistles to Timothy? What yearning affection breathes through these little letters, and yet what austerity and severity of moral tone! When off our watch-tower, such parts of the New Testament are a trumpet-call to duty full of urgency, with an imperative note which we should be traitors to disobey. The same moral effect would be produced by reading that piercing rebuke of the under shepherds in the 37th chapter of Ezekiel. But there are other books which we no doubt have at hand for such occasions. "Baxter's Reformed Pastor" is in some phases of its theology out of date; but in its solemnity, its pathos, its persuasions and instructiveness, it will always be dear to a pastor's heart. Few more searching books could be found than the late Bishop of Oxford's (Wilberforce) addresses to candidates

for ordination. These addresses enter into one's very marrow; they discern the thoughts and intents of the heart, and send us to our knees in importunate prayer that we may still and ever be counted faithful.

The main thought of to-day is how can we be better men, and it is this thought that will fill us with converting power. For, though, as we shall point out further on, it is the truth which is the instrument of conversion, and the Holy Ghost who is the source of the new life, we are the chosen vehicles for conveying the truth. The truth takes its shape from our character much as the water takes its shape from the stone jar. And the great question for every preacher is not, What have I to say? but, What am I?

The listening soul might some day take up a parable against us, and say, "I will now come and see what this religion is which you commend. I will watch your temper, your self-control, your private prayer, your home-life. Nay, I have a patent key, and I will look on your innermost thoughts and desires. I will analyze your own faith, your hopes, your ambitions."

Perhaps we start back at such a suggestion, and call it an unfair point of view. But it is the point of view which every hearer unconsciously takes. It is not religion pure, etherial, disembodied and theoretical, which they hear preached—but religion from the lips of religious teachers. And there is something in our look, in our tone, and more still in our life amongst them, which tells them what we are.

We want to convert men to Christ, and yet it is Christ as we conceive Him, as we confess Him, as we desire to follow Him. Thus we are reproducing Christian life: under our influence the same type is coming up in the Christian Church as ourselves. This, at least, is the law and tendency. We must therefore be careful that our type is high, that it is the best, or else our very success is failure; if our converts depended (as we know they do not) solely on our influence, they would indeed be imperfect manifestations of Christian power and principle.

Is there anything in our type of life that needs mending and altering? Are we who preach intense conviction ourselves loose in belief? Are we who proclaim principle ever lending ourselves to shifty expediency? Are we boasting of breadth to cover a want of spiritual earnestness? Are we narrow to atone for a mental indolence which will not look modern difficulties in the face? Are we preaching against amusements in which we ourselves indulge, or misleading young and generous minds as to the joyous nature of Christ's religion? Do we ever profess exalted and ecstatic moods which are unnatural, and yet which we put forward as supernatural? Do we push home practices of prayer and secret devotion and of Church work beyond the point of human endurance, and beyond, of course, our own? Any want of transparency and self-sincerity must weaken us. And as I could not answer any of these questions satisfactorily for myself, I pass them with great diffidence on to you. Anything that puts more savour into the salt will make it bite more. Anything that will make us more genial, gracious, broad-minded, and yet intensely earnest Christians, will most assuredly add to the converting power of our ministry.

Yet there are such great and striking differences between one man's range and powers and another's, that none of us must be discouraged. If God gives me power to convert only a few I will rejoice at the great honour, and yet sing a song when I hear that David has slain his thousands. There are men whom God seems to fix down to this special work. They are often men who go from place to place, but many of them combine the power with another one of building up a congregation through a long pastorate. The two powers are not necessarily dissociated. Sometimes one set of powers is called into exercise by the character of the people, and then the other set of powers lies dormant and perhaps tends to fade. It is worth our earnest effort to get such varied audiences in mission rooms or in the street if needs be, that the converting function may be kept well in exercise. On this side lies a great danger to settled pastors, and our evangelistic fervour dries up because we feel that there are so few sinners to convert.



But we have to beware of being discouraged. We must not fret and kick against our limitations. They are within us and around us. Some men will have more converts than others, not altogether or chiefly because they are better, but rather because they are different in themselves or their circumstances. Our limitations may be defects to be cured ; but they may be so ingrained and inherent as to mock our best efforts at improvement. Every man must by self-examination find these subjective facts out for himself. Persuasiveness, the tear trembling in the eye, the voice quivering with emotion, the heart overflowing without let or hindrance in yearnings unutterable, the setting forth of primary truths in winning and forcible terms, these are gifts which are not bestowed in full abundance on all. There are those whose function seems more austere. They appear naturally cold in public, they find themselves spontaneously stating truths in their intellectual form, and delighting in the more advanced phases of the gospel. Let each man take contentedly his own gift, and abstain from murmuring or depression.

Our limitations may be found in the congregation. One class of people will yield more striking and immediate results than another. Where habits of sin are gross and defiant, where the course of life has been openly in a worldly direction, the signs of conversion are more open to the naked eye. But the workings of the Holy Spirit in godly families and among the pious young are not so readily discernible. But it would be a fatal mistake for us to suppose that the Spirit is not, because He is not visible. He is, as we know, like the soft and invisible summer breeze, as well as like the piercing wind of winter. "Thou hearest the sound thereof, and canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of God."

And over us all there is the great mystery of the Divine Will whose wonder we cannot penetrate. We feel that in dealing with souls, whether our own or those of others, we reach limits of willing and working beyond which we cannot go. The origin of the Divine life baffles us; tempted to try



and do the work of the Holy Ghost, we hear an imperative voice bidding us not touch at our peril the ark of the Lord, or seek to handle the holy fire. We build the altar on Carmel, but then we wait for a mysterious something without which all our preparations are vain. In firm and holy confidence the prophet, who has wearied himself out in toils for God and His heritage, now pours out his heart in a prayer that hushes the multitude into deep reverence and awe (1 Kings xviii. 36, 37): "O Lord, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that Thou art God in Israel, and that I am Thy servant, and that I have done all these things at Thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me that this people may know that Thou, Lord, art God, and that Thou hast turned the heart back again."

The weapon of our warfare is gospel truth. And it may well form a part of the inquiry which will no doubt be the fruitful result of such a conference, as to what are the forms of Christian truth which we hold, and with what degree of tenacity we hold them. Conversion is the kernel of Evangelical truth, and any departure from Evangelical truth would be so far a loss of converting power on our part. We do not find Unitarianism, for example, possessed of this converting power. Romanism overlays spiritual truth with sacramental error, and loses the power. Is there anything in our own theology which threatens us with the decay or loss of this most precious and solemn gift?

It is an inquiry so important and complicated that it demands a separate and lengthy treatment. And yet it is so important that I dare not leave it untouched. We know that we have in a large measure changed our point of view during the last forty years. There has been a reaction against the mediæval notions of hell and the Calvinistic distinctions between saved and unsaved. The Fatherly nature of God has been insisted upon with great beauty by Maurice, the subjective view of the Atonement has been disclosed with wonderful spiritual power by McLeod Campbell, and the freeness of the gospel to all men has been practically settled through the influence of Erskine and others. At the same time, varied controversies have taken

place with regard to the future punishment of the impenitent; while much greater attention has been called, through such writers as Horace Bushnell, to the condition and possibilities of children in relation to the kingdom of God. However good these movements may have been—and we regard them as immense blessings—they are, after all, in a large measure human movements, and accompanied by imperfection and danger. And yet we may have been worshipping these movements and leaders as though they were gods, and we may have regarded them unconsciously to ourselves as superseding the revelations of Heaven. They may have obscured certain sides of truth from our minds in such a degree, that practically those sides are dead and inoperative.

It is therefore our duty to turn again and to turn ever to the only supreme and eternal authority for our faith, viz., the Incarnate Word, and the Incarnate Word as He revealed Himself to those nearest to Him. The geologist is never independent of the earth's crust. It is there that he finds his facts, and from them he forms his theories. We are never independent of the Scriptures. They are our masters because they keep us near God manifest in the flesh, the Logos, the supernatural Word and Manifestation of God—God in Man.

Take then those thoughts, which to some of us are so inexpressibly precious, which have come to light in modern times, and see how far their very blaze has dimmed other and equally precious truths.

We believe in the Fatherhood of God. But the austerity and justice of God remain great and portentous facts. Sinai is explained but not destroyed by Calvary. Do we believe this? If so, do we preach it?

We believe in the Atonement as the manifestation of God's love, and as intended to win over the estranged heart to God. But the fact that Christ's suffering is linked on by adamant chains which no fire of human thought can melt to human sin remains. The fact that it was a sin-bearing remains. The fact that through the blood of Christ pardon is offered by God to rebels remains. Do we believe this? If so, do we preach it?

We know that God will deal both justly and mercifully with the impenitent, and we are content perhaps to let theories of future punishment remain unsolved. But even supposing we have adopted the theory of the ultimate annihilation of the wicked, or that of the ultimate restoration of the wicked—yet certain great facts remain as accepted axioms of the Christian revelation. Real believers in Christ are possessed of a Divine life born in them by the Holy Ghost, and unbelievers have only at present a natural life of body, mind, and soul: and now there is a distinction between the two. Besides which we know that these distinctions tend in two, and only two, different directions—either toward God or away from God. We may call this tremendous duality what we will, life and death, justification and condemnation, peace and anguish, heaven and hell; but we know it exists. Do we believe this? Do we preach it?

The spiritual nurture of children presents most alluring and encouraging views to us. We find a law that the children of godly parents grow up godly, not by any irretrievable necessity, but by the sweet compulsions of human and Divine love. Yet the law is not so universal that we can absolve ourselves as parents or teachers from fear and trembling. When the Lord opens the heart, it is to attend to the things which are spoken. His Spirit fertilizes the truth. What truth? Here again we are driven in upon our convictions, and have to open again our authoritative orders as contained in the New Testament. Children will not by inherent force grow into God's kingdom. They, too, must be brought by penitence and faith. They, too, need conversion.

Great spiritual principles will not be bowed out of the House of God because we have put in some new windows and have more light. They are the pillars on which the whole structure rests. I say this the more strongly because I love modern thought in distinction to free mediæval thought, because I have often thanked God, and do still, that He has allowed me to read the marvels of present-day religious utterances, and because larger thoughts of God and larger

hopes of humanity are my daily meat and drink. But all the more must we all feel that our very blessings bring with them dangers. And if those lurking dangers should overtake us—so that we forget man's sin, man's condemnation, man's need of a crucified and sin-bearing Saviour, man's hope through Christ, the atonement for man's sin—then indeed we have been shorn of our converting power without our knowing it.

We cannot get away from a feeling of deep seriousness and responsibility in this matter :—for we are dealing with souls, souls made according to a Divine ideal, souls which have lost in a large measure the Divine superscription, souls whose possibilities of life and death are filled with marvel and mystery : and souls whose progress or retrogression are placed in some measure in our hands. "We watch for souls as those that must give account."

Yet we should strangely misunderstand the gravity and seriousness of our vocation if we did not mingle with all our thoughts of spiritual work, a great, a growing, a glowing joy. Could we but rekindle the flickering torch of gladness in our souls, and in relation to our service, we should at once redouble all our effectiveness, and this part amongst others. A depressed and drooping spirit will never be an inspiration to us. No one succeeds who does not love his work. If therefore our ministry frets, worries, wears us, some remedy must be found. And generally that remedy is not far to seek. It is often the putting of ourselves into better bodily health, or into a better temper, or into a more contented mood, or into a deeper determination to be faithful where we are instead of dreaming of other spheres where we might be more useful, or in laying in the very dust the pride which would hinder us from winning the affections of the unreasonable that we may win them to Christ. We all know how the gladness goes, and when it is gone the instrument seems to have lost all its music. Thus to-day we may do this great thing for one another, restore the joy of the ministry to one another's weary hearts. Each piece of iron amongst us may be blunt, but as we come into contact iron will sharpen iron. Each instrument may be a little out of

tune ; but there may be a mutual stringing up and a common listening to the key-note. And then as the music of our work breaks forth afresh, who so sad and weary amongst us as not to lift up his heart of gratitude to the Source of all joy ? We shall take again our work from the hands of the Master as we took it at first. "Freely ye have received, freely give."

---

### EVANGELISM IN FANEUIL HALL.

FANEUIL HALL has recently been serving a novel function. The Faneuil Hall of the past has been devoted chiefly to public bodies "on momentous occasions" in politics, moral reforms, public mourning, and popular rejoicing. Never until now has its platform been consecrated to religion. During the last weeks of January the eloquence of patriotism and of public morality has given place to the stirring appeals of ambassadors of Christ, pleading for the greater interests of the republic of God. The slumbering echoes of Otis and Webster, Everett and Phillips, have been awakened, and have mingled with the earnest voices of the popular evangelists from the South, and the fervid tones of Boston's most distinguished preacher of righteousness. The entire Christian sentiment of the city rejoices that Christ has got a hearing in Faneuil Hall.

The Georgian Methodist revivalists, popularly known as Sam Jones and Sam Small, have each held religious services in the hall upon alternate days nearly every week-day for more than two weeks. The meetings have been conducted under the auspices of a committee selected from the pastors and laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Boston and vicinity. At the hour of noon the hall has been filled with the motley crowd that usually composes a mass meeting. The spacious platform was reserved for the clergy, who came to catch a new inspiration, and to divine the secret and the method of interesting men in religion. An air of picturesqueness has been imparted to the scene

by working men in blue blouses, and market men in white frocks, scattered amongst the throng, while in the crowded galleries the bright hats of small groups of ladies gave a dash of gaiety to the spectacle. The majority of the assembly has been made up of merchants and business men of a great variety of callings, with a noticeable absence of the merchant princes. Clerks, book-keepers with pen behind the ear, men with sad faces, poverty-stricken men were there, and here and there was a shabby individual, odorous with the mingled fumes of whiskey and tobacco. Curiosity, undoubtedly, attracted many to the spot, but the earnest faces of the great majority plainly showed that they were drawn by the common impulse of desire to hear the fresh and striking presentation of the good news of God.

The keenest interest naturally centred in the unique sermons of Rev. Sam Jones. The main object of his preaching is the proper object of all revival preaching—to produce an *immediate* converting influence upon the hearts of the men before him. One gets the impression that he is in the presence of a man with whom preaching is *action* of a most serious kind. We see a man engaged in the *business of converting men* here and now. The matter of his preaching shows that he is a man of One Book. He believes “in the old Bible,” he says, “from lid to lid, from bottom to top, Jonah, whale, and all.” He fearlessly proclaims the fundamental truths of the Bible without apology for them. To his own faith they are living realities, and he makes them real to the intelligence and conscience of his hearers. His sermons are neither purely theological nor purely hortatory. Doctrine is there; but it is doctrine transmuted into terms of human experience. His topics are the perennially attractive topics that radiate from the central sun—salvation by Jesus Christ. But in his treatment the salvation becomes identical with righteousness by Jesus Christ. He constantly insists upon the *morality* of faith. In his conception of salvation a man is not converted until his power of decision has reached the satisfying climax of reckoning one hundred cents to the dollar and weighing out sixteen ounces to the pound. The every-day religion of James is

as important in his teaching as the dogmatic theology of Paul. True religion, in the rough and in detail, is the religion of life *all through*, and no other. Converting men to *that* is our revivalist's aim and enthusiasm. Hence his popularity and his influence with business men. Human experience—especially his own experience, which includes an observation of the activities and temptations of life both wide, shrewd, and searchingly keen—has been a broad educator of his thought and feeling. His armoury of experience is full of apt, novel, homelike, illustrative material, instantly available, frequently used, and always with telling effect. In the manner of his preaching he has the gift of making the elementary truths of practical religion luminously clear and vivid. He keeps the attention of the audience on the *qui vive* by stimulating their wonder as to what he will say next. The pre-eminent characteristic of his style is what Father Taylor called the "surprise power." The sensibilities of the audience were aroused by the expression of sympathy rather than by pathos. Of pathos he has but little, for he has but little humour; but of keen, penetrating wit, of irony and sarcasm, he possesses an inexhaustible fund. Laughter and applause are often the consequence of his witty sallies. He seldom appeals to the emotion of terror. The tone of his preaching, in the main, is that of hopefulness and encouragement. He uses the language of the common people, even the people of the street, and many of his short, crisp, sententious sayings are barbed arrows that will long stick fast in the memory. It goes without saying that in his method of delivery he speaks without notes, and with all the effectiveness of free speech and direct address. It would be difficult to imagine a speaker who speaks so little like a book. With so much insight, earnestness, naturalness, reality, originality, wit, raciness, fluency and directness of speech, facility of illustration, knowledge of the Bible, and experience of life, is it any wonder that multitudes flock to his preaching, and that the common people hear him gladly? It is easy to find fault with his art of putting things; and yet, notwithstanding occasionally lame logic, ungrammatical



sentences, a slangy *repertoire*, specimens of cheap rhetoric, rude and fantastic figures and expressions, the note of *genuineness* rings penetratingly clear, the nobleness and consecration of purpose is unmistakable, and criticism seems unnecessary and ungracious. The evangelists of Faneuil Hall are no pulpit mountebanks. Their preaching is not sensational, neither is it sensationless. Their word has been "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

But Faneuil Hall has echoed to preaching of an altogether different type. A different audience has been appealed to, and a different purpose has controlled the enterprise. On three successive Sunday evenings, beginning with January 23rd, in the midst of the week-day labours of the Georgian revivalists, Phillips Brooks has addressed audiences that have completely filled the capacious hall. The Trinity Club, under whose patronage the meetings have been held, believing in the possibility of reaching a large number of the non-church-going masses, particularly amongst the middle class of people, instituted these Sabbath evening services in Boston's most famous hall. The Club simply desired to extend the range of the preacher's influence, and to give to hundreds of people who never had enjoyed the opportunity of hearing him the privilege of coming into contact with his stimulating and uplifting spiritual power, and to secure it to them without money and without price. The project in no sense was intended as an opposing or even a supplementary force to the week-day revival meetings; the enterprise was conceived and the hall engaged before the Club knew of the Methodist revival. It is significant that such a beneficent undertaking should have been organized by a club that has for its main object, not specific religious or moral work, but chiefly social advantage and enjoyment. Not more than half of its members are regular attendants upon the services of Trinity Church. The scheme being in a certain sense exclusive in its scope, that is, confined to the non-church-going class, special care was taken to restrict attendance by the presentation of tickets of admission. Through the various missionary organizations in the city



the Club ascertained trustworthy information concerning the homes of the people they wished to reach, and a certain number of tickets, limited by the seating capacity of the hall, was sent out to them through different agencies.

The main floor of the hall was provided with comfortable settees; at the revival meetings the audience were obliged to stand, with the exception of those who occupied the permanent seats in the galleries. The evening audiences may fitly be described as cosmopolitan. Many nationalities, both races, white and black, and various classes of people were represented. Messrs. Jones and Small preached chiefly to men; Phillips Brooks addressed men, women, and children. The revivalists spoke to hundreds of Christian men who gave aid and sympathy by their presence, while scores of bright, energetic men, unaccustomed to the inside of a church, were eager listeners day after day. Dr. Brooks preached to an audience almost entirely bereft of the professedly Christian element. The week-day meetings were intended to be "revival" meetings; the Sabbath evening services were avowedly outside the line of revival aims and methods, and were "preaching services" pure and simple. The Revival Committee depended but little upon the adjuncts of the sermon; Sam Jones was regarded as a host in himself; the devotional exercise was brief but earnest; Mr. Excell, a religious balladist, furnished an effective element of interest by his singing; and one or two familiar Moody and Sankey hymns mildly aroused the contagious sympathy of the audience as they participated in the simple service of song. Trinity Club, on the contrary, wisely appreciated the power of music over the masses. A half hour before the preaching began was devoted to congregational singing, led by a strong chorus which included many members of the Harvard Glee Club. An orchestra from Carter's Band accompanied the congregational singing, and lent stirringly efficacious aid and guidance. A policeman present remarked that people would go a long way just to hear such singing. The devotional service was also interspersed with music, and people discovered that an Episcopalian could pray without his Prayer-

book, as their hearts were led upwards through the sincere, fervent petitions of Dr. Brooks. Neither were the band and surplice necessary to the preaching. A Christian minister who is first and always a Christian *man* stood before the vast throng in all his magnitude and magnetism. The simple majesty of his presence filled the eye and riveted the attention before he uttered a word. Nor was his customary manuscript a necessity to the preacher. He spoke to them as a preacher and not as a reader. His themes were at once spiritual and practical, and adapted to the religious needs of his immediate audience, so thoroughly unused to preaching. His aim was to bring them into vital contact with God in Christ. In plain, forcible, and beautiful language, he appealed to what was highest and best in them, and spoke to them of God's quick, responsive sympathy with every heart that cries out to be free from the deadly and destructive power of sin, and urged them to assert their self-respect as God's children by a frank and entire trust in the Father's love and immediate submission to it. With his habitual exuberance of diction and lucidness of exposition, infused with imagination and sensibility, he presented the varied aspects of God's love and man's duty, and played upon their hearts as upon an instrument, but—he played *too fast*. "He talks too rapidly," said an intelligent machinist; "he throws off brilliant ideas when rushing along as an emery wheel throws off sparks, but," he added, with more of truth than he was aware, "*it's partly the trouble with our ears.*" With the single exception of excessive speed, Dr. Brooks evinced a faculty of address to a popular assembly greater than had been expected from the cultivated scholar accustomed to addressing the cultured, the rich, and the great. What was the effect of this preaching? A Divine voice must answer that. But this much is certain, that men and women who had not heard the gospel for many a year understood and felt Christ's truth in their hearts, had their torpid consciences quickened, their sleeping reverence aroused, and their humane and spiritual impulses directed toward the true life in Christ. They wanted to hear the

devout and glowingly earnest preacher again. They were touched by his brotherliness. The best part of the sermon was *himself*; it seemed to be a part of his daily life generously imparted to them as a precious gift; hence he spoke to them with living power.

Although the results of Phillips Brooks's preaching were not achieved through the technical "revival" motive, there is room for doubt if the professional revivalists reaped the anticipated harvest. Their success, too, is for the Divine eye to discover and the great day to reveal. Mr. Jones says that in Boston he met with the greatest success of his evangelistic experience. But it is not untruthful or ungenerous to say that, while the spiritual impulse imparted has been great, still the results have not been commensurate with the expectation, or with the plans prepared. Boston has been religiously agitated, but not shaken from circumference to centre as by Moody and Sankey in 1877. The spiritual rewards, too, have been appropriated chiefly and rightfully by one sect only, and we are unfeignedly glad for our Methodist brethren. The fields of harvest were not Faneuil Hall and Tremont Temple; they were the People's Church and other churches where the old-fashioned anxious-seat and inquiry-meeting were used as instrumentalities of immediate decision. Does the reason of the comparative unfruitfulness and the limited influence lie in the failure of power on the part of the famous evangelists? Apparently not. Was there too much dependence placed upon the two men of God to *arouse* religious interest and too little dependence upon God Himself and persistent waiting upon Him *before* the preachers came? Was there diligent preparation and wise organization by a union of Christian workers, irrespective of sect or creed, as in the great Tabernacle movement of 1877? We are not unmindful that such a union was sought for and declined. It may be that the constant element of wide-spread and powerful revivals was not energetically present: success accompanies the felt presence of the Supernatural Factor and intensity of waiting upon Him. It may be that the way of the Spirit in His moving upon the face of unchris-

tianized society is taking some new path and mode of action which our diligent seeking and spiritual insight are to discover. "There are diversities of operations but the same Spirit."

After agitation ought to come conservation. Are the actual results being gathered and utilized? It is gratifying to learn that seventy business men have already assumed the financial responsibility of opening an audience-room in the vicinity of Faneuil Hall to continue the week-day religious services under the efficient charge of Rev. Dr. Bates. A striking fact is that most of the seventy have not been connected heretofore with any of the churches. A training-school for Christian workers, similar to Mr. Moody's in Chicago, and to Rev. Dr. Seymour's in the Ruggles Street Church, Boston, is a powerful auxiliary in vitally engrafting the new Christian lives into the churches. It is Mr. Moody, we believe, who rebukes us for not *drawing the net*.

Why should not religion make its incursion into the business of the week? Why should not Boston, and all the large cities of the country, emulate Joseph Parker's Thursday noonday religious lectureship in the very heart of busy London? For years this lectureship has been one of the most powerful regenerating influences of the English metropolis. No one minister in Boston may be able to sustain such a lectureship; but the enterprising and inventive Trinity Club might perfect an organization that could do it. Is not the King's Chapel Wednesday-noon religious service a possible subject for expansion? The Christian force stored up in Boston, if directed with judicious enthusiasm, can animate the religious life of the city in the middle of the week, as the weekly prayer-meeting sustains the vigour of the individual church.

From the testimony already gained from the representatives of the non-church-goers at Faneuil Hall of the great value, enjoyment, and interest of those services we are convinced that the Trinity Club has not exhausted its resources, its privilege, or its opportunity. The experiment is a prophecy. It may be too much to ask the already overworked

rector of Trinity Church again to become the sole preacher. It may be unwise. Undoubtedly, his powerful personality and splendid gifts, with the interesting musical element, was the twofold attractive force of the recent enterprise. But four or five months of Sunday evenings in the year, devoted to preaching in Faneuil Hall to the multitude who are removed from all religious influences, and conducted by various popular clergymen, is among the possibilities of Christian enterprise. Such a service would go far toward the solution of the problem, How to reach the non-church-going masses. But the preachers must be *preachers* and not mere sermonizers. The pulpit must be a *free* pulpit, or it cannot be a pulpit of power. With a wise "drawing of the net," the various churches would be greatly increased in membership and in spiritual energy.

The Trinity Club experiment has plainly shown that pulpit eccentricity and bad taste are not a *sine quâ non* in popular preaching. Roughness of speech, aggressiveness of method, brilliant flashes of wit, highly seasoned anecdote and illustration, grotesqueness, and egotism, are not essentials in preaching to the masses. Phillips Brooks did not raise a laugh, elicit an "amen," or start a ripple of applause. Under the spell of his chaste, serious, impassioned eloquence the great throngs sat with rapt attention, and went slowly and thoughtfully away with truer views of religious duty, and a revelation of their spiritual possibilities; life was looked at from a new standpoint, helpful lessons were in their minds, new ambitions were roused, new hopes inspired, and sad hearts were warmed and cheered. The earnest rector who abides and the earnest revivalists who depart have left Boston better for these recent services. The religious function of Faneuil Hall need not be a temporary one. The old Cradle of Liberty can become permanently sacred to patriotism, morality, and religion.

[We are indebted for this article to the *Andover Review*, and have taken it believing that it would interest our readers because of its valuable suggestions as to a new character of Christian work.]

### THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ITS PROPERTY.\*

It is hard to see how the extreme theory of the Anglican school, even if it be granted, bears upon the question of the Establishment. Looking first to the point of special privilege involved, that is, at all that is included in the idea of Establishment, we ask, and have a right to ask, the ground on which the Anglican Catholic Church claims in that capacity to be the Church of the nation. Anglicans have a right, which we should not dream of disputing, to isolate themselves from all Protestants, or indeed from all other Christians, either in this country or in others. This dignified solitude of dignity which is thus cultivated, may or may not be very impressive, but if there are those who choose to cultivate it, and to regard their Church in the same spirit with which they look at everything which is supposed to be distinctively English, no one has a right to interfere with their enjoyment. This strong insular prejudice which so often calls down upon us the contempt of other nations, is nowhere so out of place as in the sphere of religion. We may be proud of our political English institutions, we may glorify the common sense which is supposed to be the characteristic of the special English intellect, we may plume ourselves upon English manners and English morals, as though they had a distinct merit of their own. The boasting is not very admirable, but it injures only the boaster. It is different when we have to speak of religion. There we ought surely to rise above this mere provincialism, and to understand that everything which gives a creed or a Church system some distinctive mark of nationality mars its true beauty, and interferes with its power. The gospel as revealed to us in the life and work of our Master comes down to us without a touch of Judaism upon it, and it certainly ill becomes to stamp upon it any national peculiarities of our own. Still, if there

\* *Church and Dissent: A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment.* By ROUNDELL, EARL OF SELBORNE. (Macmillan & Co.)

are those who think otherwise, we desire to exercise no power. We deny only their right to impose their views upon us.

The Anglican Church enjoys its national authority by the will of Parliament, and could not hold it otherwise. We are often challenged to produce any evidence that the State ever separated between churches, giving precedence to one and relegating all others to a position of inferiority. If a statement of the kind has ever been made in its bold form, it is of course not to be defended. The mode in which most of our institutions in England have taken their shape leaves an opening for strong and startling assertions, such as that the Church never was established or endowed, which may not be possible to disprove, but which nevertheless involve an entire misrepresentation of the facts. Up to the time of the Reformation, the Church and the State were coterminous, and their relations curiously tangled and complicated. The Reformation introduced an entirely new state of things, and from that moment it recognized freedom of religious thought, and so gave birth to Dissent. From that time the distinct action of the State began. It may be said that it did not establish a Protestant Church or any Church. But it enacted laws which deprived some of status and endowments, and transferred them to others. Cardinal Fisher was a prelate of the Church; but he lost not only his office but his life, because he was loyal to the Pope and the ecclesiastical authority which hitherto had been supreme in England. He and his fellow religionists, and their successors have been treated as Romish Dissenters, simply because they have adhered to the law of the Church as it existed in England prior to the action of Henry VIII. How is it that what was legal in 1500 became illegal in 1560, and that bishops and clergy would have been liable to heavy penalties, even to imprisonment and death, at the latter period for the performance of services which were incumbent upon them at the former? Can it be seriously argued that this could have been effected except by the authority of the State, and if this be so, how is it possible to contend that the State has not distinguished between one Church and another?



The argument does not end here ; the changes wrought by the Reformation went on. Men thought for themselves, and while some retained their old faith, others went on to a more advanced and, as we hold, more consistent Protestantism. The result was first a Parliamentary and then a military conflict, which after various vicissitudes resulted in the Act of Uniformity of 1662, which gave to the Anglican Church the character which it at present retains. That Act was simply the prize of military success. Had the ultimate victory in the war remained with the Puritan party, the Anglican Church would have assumed an entirely different aspect if indeed we had not been left without any Established Church at all. The State has therefore to all intents and purposes made a distinction ; the Church of England holds its present position not in virtue of a Divine right as the Holy Catholic Church, but because of the influence which it has been able to exert over the State. This is the injustice against which we, as Nonconformists, protest. We must submit as best we can to the sentence of outlawry pronounced upon us by the High Church system. But as citizens of the same empire, with the same responsibilities and duties as devolve upon Conformists, we claim that the State at least shall not ratify this sentence by its authority.

This is however precisely what is done when the law forbids the minister of the State Church to exchange even the ordinary courtesies of ecclesiastical life such as the exchange of pulpits with his Nonconformist neighbour. We have never thought of requiring that such fraternity should be enforced, nor can we expect it of those who deny that we are ministers, or our churches churches of Christ. But it becomes another thing when the law interferes and positively forbids such fellowship. Looked at from a civil and not from an ecclesiastical point of view, what wrong have we committed that the stigma should be forced upon us ? Our critics taunt us with our narrowness. But where is there illiberality or narrowness amongst us compared with that which is shown in this separation ? We may be and are told continually that Disestablishment would tend to

separate Churchmen and Dissenters still more widely. We have too much faith in the piety and Christian charity of a large body of the clergy, and in the practical wisdom of an increasing number of the clergy who regard these points of separation as belonging to the infinitely little to believe in such a prediction. But if it should unhappily be fulfilled we must accept the position, and trust to the influence of time and the growth of *Christian* charity to produce a state of feeling and conduct more becoming the gospel of Christ. We shall have gained all that we shall ask or desire to ask of the State when we have got rid of its unwise and unwarranted interference in matters on which it has no claim to speak at all.

But it is here that the question of the Church's property comes in. Two classes of Churchmen at least are more or less favourable to Disestablishment, provided it be not associated with Disendowment. Many High Churchmen who will not allow themselves to be imposed upon by the specious representations which are employed to mask the supremacy of the State over the Church, and who are ever fretting under the yoke, would gladly escape this friction by securing independence even at the cost of status and privilege. They would not abandon their pretensions to spiritual authority, they would still claim to be the "Catholic" Church in and of England, but they would be satisfied to forfeit the recognition at present given by the State on condition of entire emancipation from State control. At the other extreme of the ecclesiastical world are Churchmen who have an honest desire for religious equality. They do not esteem themselves ministers of Christ in any other sense or by virtue of any other title than is enjoyed by others who are not of their Church, and they are desirous, as far as possible, to beat down the barriers which the law has set up between themselves and their Dissenting neighbours and friends. This latter class may not be numerous, but it is on the increase. It is to be regretted that it is not composed, to any large extent, of those whose Evangelical principles ought to bring them into closest affinity with Nonconformists, but rather of men who belong to the

Broad Church party, and even its extreme section. This point need not, however, detain us now. More relevant to our purpose is it to note that these liberal-minded Churchmen agree with all others in insisting that the revenues of the Church shall be maintained intact. Some of them, indeed, are willing, indeed anxious, that the Church should be made more comprehensive, so as to include the entire Christianity of the nation, but each new suggestion in that direction only serves to show that of all dreams this is the most visionary. In the meantime, those who indulge it use it as a justification for the continuance of the present system which they nevertheless confess to be unequal and unjust.

What it practically comes to is that we must submit to inequality, because these two questions of privilege and property are so intimately mixed up that the loss of the one must entail the forfeiture of the other. But why should this be so? The answer of the Erastian, of course, is that a Church with so large an income must be under the control of the State. What advantages have resulted from this so-called control it is not easy to discover. It exists in theory, and the very assumption is a humiliation to the Church, but the attempt to exercise the authority has ended from time to time in so miserable a fiasco, that it is no security to the State. There is a Bill at present before Parliament introduced by the Bishop of Carlisle which proposes to place acts of Convocation in the same position as the minutes of the Education department, or the proposals of the Charity Commission, that is, to debar Parliament from any discussion of their details, and to provide for their becoming law after they have been laid for a certain time on the tables of both Houses. The control is acknowledged by this striving after liberty. But were the Bishop's Bill passed the liberty would not be secured. Parliament would not lose its own initiative—could, for example, pass another Public Worship Regulation Act over the heads of bishops, Convocation, and clergy—and it would have its own veto over any proposals coming from Convocation. All that it would sacrifice would be the power of discussing details in the

latter. At present the Church cannot have the simplest measure of national reform, such as that which is now before the Legislature for the arrangements of the Truro Cathedral, without the express sanction of Parliament. Despite the loud and angry denials of those who resent an interference they cannot escape, the control is absolute.

But the most resolute Erastian can hardly regard the endeavours to enforce it with much satisfaction. The late Dean of Westminster, indeed, seemed to consider the State as a kind of instrument employed by God to correct clerical faults. The appeal to Cæsar was an appeal from prejudice and bigotry to enlightened common sense and impartial justice, and the decisions of the Privy Council were hailed by him as though they were the utterances of supernatural wisdom. It must be noted, however, that so far as they were satisfactory to him, they were in direct contradiction to the Erastian contention with which we are dealing, that the State Church must be maintained in order that the clergy may be under the restraints of the law. The effect of the Judgments Dean Stanley so much admired was to make the clergy largely independent of law, and, in fact, to alter the entire constitution of the Establishment. It is governed by an Act of Uniformity, but the practical result of the action of the Courts is infinite diversity. It is hard to say whether Mr. Gorham, or Mr. Bennett, or Professor Jowett was furthest removed from the ideal of the Prayer Book, but assuredly it could never have been intended to comprehend the three under one Statute of Uniformity. The Privy Council included them all in the Anglican Church under the provisions of an Act whose whole policy was exclusiveness of the most narrow and persecuting type. The man who can read the Act of Uniformity in connection with its history, and then say that the object of its authors was to make the Church comprehensive, or that a Church hemmed in by such limitations can fairly and honestly be comprehensive, must have been educated in some school where the ordinary conditions of thought and speech are entirely reversed. So far, however, as that Act was meant to assert the control of the State, its purpose has been defeated by judge-made law.

The Public Worship Regulation Act was an endeavour to restore its authority in one particular direction. If there was one thing which, more than any other, had been more constantly and emphatically proclaimed from evangelical platforms, it was that the Church of England was a Protestant Church, nay, was the very bulwark of Protestantism. But facts did not bear out the assertion, and the Act was passed in order to save the Church from the scandal which was being brought upon it by the excesses of the "Catholic" members. With what a flourish of trumpets was this proposed assertion of the power of the State hailed in and out of Parliament. Mr. Disraeli, of all men in the universe, was the heaven-sent champion of Protestantism, and Sir William Harcourt was his prophet. It may be hoped that as the latter gentleman was cured of his hostility to Mr. Gladstone by his experience in that unhappy episode, so it may also have taught him the weakness and folly of that Erastianism in which hitherto he had gloried. For never was failure more pitiable or the demonstration of the impotence of the State in any conflict with the conscience of the clergy more complete and conclusive. It is easy to talk about controlling the Church, but the instincts of Englishmen are so strong in opposition to everything that savours of persecution, that whenever you try to restrain individual men, popular sympathy is awakened. There was nothing very striking about Mr. Green or his friend and patron, Sir Percival Heywood, and, on the other hand, the late Bishop of Manchester was one of the wisest and noblest prelates the English Church has seen for many a day, and his one offence was that he asserted that supremacy of law for the sake of which Erastians maintain that the union between Church and State should be preserved. Yet the very men who urge this were ready to turn round and rend the bishop simply because he did his duty. It will always be so. The people recoil from the infliction of penalties for any theological or ecclesiastical offences, and so the clergy who are able to persuade their consciences that they are observing the terms of their subscription obtain an extraordinary

amount of practical independence in a Church which the State professes to regulate by an Act of Uniformity.

It is difficult, indeed, to understand how any one, who is at all familiar with the attitude of the Anglican clergy, can suppose that the State exercises a healthful influence either in curbing their arrogance or restraining their theological or ritualistic extravagances. If it had abated clerical arrogance, it would certainly be one of the most remarkable examples of an effect directly opposite to that which might have been expected from the cause in operation which is on record. A man who has been taught to regard himself as one of a sacred order is put down in a parish with a commission from the State to be the one religious teacher of the people. Another may come, with piety as approved, with gifts as eminent, in labours as abundant, and in zeal as fervid; but the parish priest is entitled, nay, is instructed, to regard him as an intruder, and therefore a nuisance. To expect the occupant of such a position to display great meekness and humility is to ask too much. He is almost bound to assert himself, for unless he does he may be supposed to sacrifice those interests of the Church with which he has been placed in trust; and that is in fact the plea continually urged by clergymen for their refusal to associate with Nonconformists. Mr. Matthew Arnold may assert that it is not his "ordinary self" which he asserts; but we doubt whether the ecclesiastical self will be found at all less offensive. Looking at the conditions of their official lives, our wonder is that there are so many of the clergy in whom a spirit of "sweet reasonableness" may be found.

We contend, therefore, that the Erastian fails to secure the ends for which he desires to maintain the Establishment. Over the Church, as a whole, the State exercises a real control; but over the individual clergyman this is reduced almost to a minimum. Convocation cannot alter even a solitary rubric without the consent of Parliament; but there is many a clergyman who, in his own parish, is setting at defiance some of the most plain requirements of the Prayer Book: introducing all kinds of unwarranted and,

some of them, positively illegal novelties ; working his own sweet will, either as to the doctrine he preaches or the ritual he observes. He could not do worse were the Church disestablished. We have ourselves never been able to understand what are the exact dangers supposed to lurk in the existence of a great ecclesiastical corporation endowed with large funds, and only controlled by the State in the same way as other religious communities. In our judgment the danger lies rather in the present state of things when political power is added to enormous revenues.

But though some politicians may desire to keep the Church in this subjection, it is strange that Churchmen should be so ready to acquiesce in it if they are so satisfied, as their arguments imply, that the property they hold is the private estate of their Church, with which the nation has no right of interference. The State which did not give has certainly no right to take away, and, if it should think it wise not to grant a national status to the Episcopal Church, must certainly not go further and deprive it of revenues with which it has been endowed by the munificence of its own members. Why, then, should the Church submit to the interference of the State when all it receives in return are invidious privileges ? Of course with those who desire an Establishment for its own sake this argument can have no weight, but with others who are compelled to acknowledge that if an Establishment has its advantages there are also very serious drawbacks, and that it is not quite certain to which side the balance may incline, it must tell. Indeed, we might expect all Churchmen to resent the suggestion that their clergy need to be held in with bit and bridle, and must therefore be kept in connection with the State which will administer the property, determine the doctrines, and in general manage the affairs of their Church. Surely, if the property be its own, its best friends would be those who insisted upon its independence.

Lord Selborne has lent the weight of his great name to this "private property" theory, and it seems somewhat rash to dispute the dictum of an expert so distinguished.



His lordship says he holds that the case of the Church of England in this respect is "not different from that of the Wesleyan body or of any Nonconformist denomination having local and particular trusts and endowments, but not one general trust or endowment for the whole denomination. The general body is endowed not collectively, but in its several parts; it has an interest in the endowment of every part." We doubt whether his lordship's analogy would hold water. He is certainly very unfortunate in the selection of the Wesleyan body for special notice, for if there is a Nonconformist denomination whose property belongs to the corporation, and not its several parts, it is the Wesleyan. As regards Congregationalists, the denomination has no corporate interests at all, unless we may regard the Memorial Hall, the funded property of the Pastors' Retiring and Christian Witness Funds, and the small investments of the Union, as answering to this description. In truth his lordship must seek his illustrations elsewhere if he is to meet this, which after all is only the initial difficulty of his case. The property belongs, according to him, and according also to Freeman and other competent authorities, to corporations scattered up and down the country. Yet it has always been treated as though it were the estate of a national corporation called the Church of England, and Parliament has dealt with it accordingly. It is thus put in a lecture on "Facts and Fallacies relative to Disendowment:—"

The appointment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, with all the changes to which it has led, the impoverishment of some bishoprics and the creation of others, the reduction of capitular establishments in order to provide for some new office, or to increase the miserable stipends of the inferior clergy; in fact, the general disturbance of the alleged rights of these corporations and the subordination of their individual interests to promote the general good of the whole, is itself sufficient to indicate an essential difference between the tenure on which these corporations hold their property and that on which other corporations hold theirs. It may be said, indeed, that these are only the internal changes which have been found necessary for the work of the Church, and which have been wisely and amicably arranged by her own members. But the plea is excluded if the property is not that of one Church but of a number of separate corporations. There is no

more reason, on this showing, why Winchester should be deprived of its London palace in order to find funds for a bishopric at St. Albans (that is, to provide for the creation of an entirely new corporation), or why the Durham bishopric should sacrifice some of its immense wealth to supplement the funds of some poor rectory, than there is why the Corporation of the City of London should give up a part of its revenues to help a new municipality that might be created at Croydon, or for rich Liverpool to eke out the scanty means of some small borough where sanitary reform is retarded by the fear of unduly increasing the rates. We have only to fancy the agitation which would be created by some proposal of this kind, and to compare it with the calmness with which these suggestions for the transfer of ecclesiastical revenues are treated in order to appreciate the difference which exists between them in the general estimation of the public.

*(To be continued).*

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

ONE of the most distinguished and honoured ministers in the Congregational, or any other church, says, in a private letter, "I am glad that the political atmosphere is somewhat clearing, but we need all our coolness if the Liberal party is to be saved and the right done." Our own diagnosis of the situation, as it is at present, is not so sanguine as that of our friend; but his closing observations we would emphasize to the utmost possible extent. Seldom has the truth of the saying of the Old Book, "A brother offended is harder to be won than a strong city," been more copiously or more painfully illustrated. On every side we hear the notes of angry vituperation, and too often they come from those from whom they were least to be expected. One of the latest examples is found in the violent speech of Lord Selborne, in the House of Lords, against his old leader and friend. His lordship will, probably, not like to be compared to Mr. Labouchere; but that gentleman's tirades against Mr. Chamberlain, disgusting as they are, constitute but a mild offence as compared with the attack of the former Lord Chancellor upon the Prime Minister under

whom he served so long and who certainly was never lacking in courtesy or consideration for him. Those who profess to be Christian politicians ought never to forget their Christianity in politics, and surely it is one virtue of that Christianity to be just or even generous in dealing with those from whom we differ in opinion. Lord Selborne believes that the best way of subduing Irish lawlessness is to put it down with the strong hand of the law; Mr. Gladstone holds that the failures of this method in the past should lead us, as wise men, to try another, in the hope that it may bring into harmony two nations who have too long been alienated from each other. Is it magnanimous, is it just, is it commonly decent for one who has been on intimate terms with Mr. Gladstone during his long life and has had innumerable opportunities of knowing his high character, to hurl at him imputations of sympathy with crime and desire to shield criminals? Lord Selborne is not well advised, to use no stronger word, in condescending to use such weapons. He should leave them to Lord Randolph Churchill.

But especially ought we, as Nonconformists, to observe this self-restraint. There are differences of opinion amongst ourselves on this Irish policy; but it is not necessary that we become excited or angry with each other about it. Why should we make ourselves parties to the hot personal controversies which are being waged around us, except so far as these affect those great principles for which we are concerned. We have never ceased to preach, though our voice may have been as of one crying in the wilderness, that Liberalism was greater than any of its leaders, and—we must add—far greater than this Irish question. We insist upon the same point still, and more especially do we urge that Nonconformist Liberals, though they cannot agree, should, at all events, respect each other's conscientious convictions. The only desire of all parties amongst us (for happily we have in our ranks but few Orange bigots) is that justice shall be done. It is not surprising that there should be diversity of judgment as to how

this end is to be obtained; but if we are all honestly working to the same point we ought not to judge one another harshly because we cannot all at once agree as to the mode of action. It must never be forgotten that there is work ahead of this Irish struggle which more intimately affects us and all in which we are most deeply interested, and even for the lower reasons of expediency as well as for those of Christian principle, we should cultivate the spirit of charity. We do not mean that we should be unfaithful to our convictions or indulge in honied compliments where there is need for strong remonstrance. Mr. Berry said at Wolverhampton, not as *The Daily News* gave it in its condensed report, that the "time for re-union was past," but that the time for "attempts at re-union" was past. We fully agree with him. The path to reconciliation lies, not through private conferences, which are quite as likely to beget new misunderstandings, but through the quiet, persistent and good-tempered advocacy of what we hold to be right. Above all, we need to beware of the excitement produced by the innumerable personal stories which are afloat. This is one of the worst features of the times. The gossip of the lobbies filtrates into all circles, chiefly through the newspaper correspondents, and that gossip is never fully trustworthy, while, too often, it is malignant and mendacious. If we are to judge of men, and it is difficult to avoid the expression of opinion on those who claim to lead, we ought to judge them only by their known words and actions, and even in relation to them to remember that there is a secret history behind them which, did we know it, might greatly modify our views. We plead simply for charity and for patience. We see a great party shivered in pieces, but we will not abandon the hope that it may yet be re-united, and we are anxious to eschew word or act which could hinder a consummation so desirable.

As to our own position we feel that there is need for great plainness of speech. We are not committed to any special solution of the Irish difficulty, but we regard Mr. Gladstone

as the one living statesman who has shown himself competent to deal with it. His first attempt failed mainly, as we think, from over-anxiety to reconcile too many conflicting interests. His bills will not be revived, but as yet we have not any plan before us which challenges competition with his. It is unfair to say that he adheres to it in its entirety because he has not proposed any other. The move now is with his Liberal critics, and they refuse to make it, leaving the Tory party to introduce their present measures. The longer this policy is continued the more likely is Mr. Gladstone to become absolute master of the position. We have heard of a very able and distinguished opponent of the Bills of last year who has said that he would accept them at once rather than consent to this new attempt at suppression. As time goes on and the effects of coercion become more apparent, there will be more of such converts. Radical Unionists are throwing away their chances by declining to suggest an alternative scheme, and making it the more certain that, if Mr. Gladstone's political career be extended but a little longer, to him will the honour of the settlement belong. At all events, it is to him we look not only as the statesman whose transcendent genius best qualifies him for such a task, but also as the one who by the breadth of his sympathies is best fitted to conciliate the jealous susceptibilities of the Irish people, while at the same time asserting the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament.

---

*The Times* seems to be doing its utmost to realize Mr. Stead's idea of "Government by Journalism," but the practical result is to show that of all kinds of rule that would be the worst. For lack of political insight, for utter contempt of justice and fair play, for recklessness in statement and wildness of denunciation, and for an absolute indifference to consequences, the articles of *The Times* against Home Rule are unparalleled even in its own dreary record. The organ of Printing House Square has always been on the side of privileged classes, and always ready to abet their injustice and oppression until it became manifest that the

day was lost. It is never the champion of a forlorn cause, but so long as there is any hope it fights with a recklessness which detracts materially from its force; serving rather to exasperate opponents without rendering real help to its friends. The late Bishop of Manchester, writing from America in 1865, says :

Though I respect John Walter for many points in his character, he really is so puffed up with the conceit that he is a sort of walking incarnation of the wisdom of *The Times*, that his defeat didn't draw any tears from my eyes. If he wants his conceit lessened he should come to America and hear what the Yankees say and think of his newspaper. He would really stand a good chance of being tarred and feathered. In the hotel at Montreal I saw Dr. Charles Mackay, who, for the last three years of the war, was *The Times'* correspondent at New York. I looked upon him with anything but liking as the man who, more than any one else (except, perhaps, Lord Russell, and he has done it unintentionally, because it is his nature to write irritating despatches), has stirred up the bad blood between us and the Americans, or, rather, between the Americans and us.

The same wicked work which *The Times* did in the early "sixties," by endeavouring to fan the feeling of hostility between Great Britain and the North, it has recently been doing in relation to the English and the Irish peoples with a passion, a persistency, and a violence in which it has contrived to outdo its own worst achievements in the past. Also history is continually repeating itself. *The Times*, unwarned by its former experiences, makes the same excited appeals to the worst prejudices of society, and, alas ! finds a certain number of people who implicitly follow its lead in happy forgetfulness of the fact how often it has been a "blind leader of the blind." We doubt not it will be in the future as it has been in the past. Reaction will come, and in a happier future there will be some wise man, like Bishop Fraser, who will utter his lamentations over the conceit and the folly of these would-be guides of public opinion, and who will write about Mr. Buckle, Dr. Patten, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Arnold Forster, as the Bishop writes about Dr. Charles Mackay. The men who are thus stirring up bad blood between two peoples

have on their heads a responsibility which it is not easy fully to measure. They are assuredly the worst enemies of the Union, for if there be one thing certain amid the difficulties and complications of the present crisis, it is that Ireland can never be permanently kept in union with Great Britain by the policy of Mr. Buckle and his associates.

---

One of the great misfortunes of the present time is the apparent lack of justice, not to say generosity and chivalry, in the treatment of Mr. Parnell and his friends. The most glaring example of this is the extraordinary assumption that, unless the Irish Members are prepared to take legal action against *The Times* for the statements in its pamphlet on "Parnellism and Crime," they must be held guilty of all the accusations made against them. If this view were started in relation to any other individuals about whom Englishmen could exercise a dispassionate judgment, it is certain that such a suggestion would be received with the scorn it so well deserves. In the English law the presumption is always in favour of the accused, and the *onus probandi* lies on the accuser. The accusation of *The Times* is no proof, and so far as it is concerned, it is amply met by a denial on the part of those whom it accuses. Take the most flagrant case, that of Mr. Parnell. *The Times* publishes the facsimile of a letter professedly written by him. On the face of it it bears the stamp of the highest improbability. If Mr. Parnell was the author of the document in question, the credit which he has attained as one of the astutest of political leaders is gone for ever. Yet we are asked, on the mere authority of *The Times*, which throws it down before us without a word of explanation, to believe that this is a genuine document in face of the strong and emphatic denial of Mr. Parnell himself. It says that "unless further steps are taken to bring the matter before a court of law it is difficult to see what more we can do to prove our own good faith in the charges we believe to be true." But the question is not at all as to the good faith of *The Times*, but as to the truth of a charge in itself im-



probable and positively denied by the party concerned. Of course a decision in a court of law could not be obtained in time to undo the mischief which a mere accusation is calculated to do, and in this respect *The Times* has been singularly crafty in selecting a time for the production of these charges.

We have no desire to prejudge the case, or to underrate the gravity of the accusation. It is so serious that we hold it ought to be immediately dealt with by a committee of the House of Commons. It is cruel to tell a man, and that man the leader of a great national party, that he must lie under an imputation of falsehood and murder unless he bring an action against his accusers. The time may come for that, but this is a matter which does not brook delay, and which would certainly be better decided by a carefully chosen committee of the House than by any jury. Mr. Parnell has given his emphatic denial to the charge in the House itself, and if it is not prepared to accept that as conclusive, it remains with it to appoint the tribunal by which these opposing statements shall be judged.

*The Daily News*, in speaking of the welcome given to Mr. Goschen, by the Tory party, on his election for St. George's, the "Toriest constituency of the Toriest city" in the country, said that "he received one of the most enthusiastic receptions ever accorded to any apostate since the days of Julian." Is it quite fair to call Mr. Goschen an apostate? Has he ever been anything but a Tory? At all events, when could he ever be regarded as a Liberal? We know not any rational definition of the name under which he would have been included. If it means sympathy with the democracy, there is hardly one of his colleagues in the front bench, except possibly the Home Secretary, who has less. If it implies opposition to class privileges, this certainly is not to be expected from the champion of the Established Church and friend of the Egyptian bondholders. It was impossible that a man of so much ability and culture could identify himself with the stupid party; and because he advocated certain practical reforms (among

them the admission of Dissenters to the Universities), and because, with his wide commercial knowledge and experience, he could not but take a broader view of financial questions than was common among Tories, he was reckoned a Liberal, and was even regarded as a possible candidate for the leadership. But that was in 1874, when the Liberal party was in a fit of depression. It has advanced far since then, and every step it has taken has removed it still further from Mr. Goschen. He is now precisely where he ought to be, or at least he will be when he has taken the place which Mr. W. H. Smith supposes himself to be filling at present. That gentleman's leadership is a heavy joke, and the only wonder is that the House does not break out into uncontrollable laughter every time that that most admirable mediocrity rises in all his ponderous dignity to guide (save the mark!) the counsels of a House in which are found Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Hartington. Mr. Goschen is marked out for the position of Conservative chief, and it will be a step gained in the re-arrangement of parties when the Tories have accepted as their chief a statesman so thoroughly in sympathy with their traditional policy, and at the same time so fully competent to hold his own in debate. Whether their new ally is likely to secure them much favour in the country is a different question. *The Times* worships at his shrine, and a number of middle-class magnates are ready to echo its praises; but there his influence ends. That is, Mr. Goschen affects those who are already more than half-converted to Toryism. In the class which lies beyond—the democracy—he is, of all politicians, the most unpopular. What his relations are to be to Tory democracy it is not possible to divine. His future development, indeed, will be a curious and interesting study. Probably he may still regard himself as a Liberal, and as the delusion is confined to himself it may be a harmless one. Not until the Ethiopian change his skin and the leopard his spots is he likely to find a place among Liberal chiefs again. It is a distinct gain that we have not to reckon with the presence of the "Egyptian skeleton" at our council-board.

The death of Mr. Newdegate reminds us of a curious incident, in which he was the principal actor, which occurred more than twenty years ago. There was no known connection between Mr. Newdegate and Dissenting ministers, and, in fact, it was not easy to discover a point of affinity between them. It was, therefore, with considerable surprise that a number of them, including ourselves, received an invitation to meet the member for North Warwickshire at the London Tavern. The object of the conference was not stated, and the number who responded to the invitation was not very large. The late Dr. Vaughan was of the number, and we well remember his coming to us prior to the commencement of the meeting, and speculating as to what its purpose could possibly be. We were not long left in doubt. The worthy, but extremely narrow and short-sighted, gentleman who had called us together had actually conceived the hope that he might unite us in some kind of Protestant league for carrying out the views with which his name was so closely identified. Of course the conference came to nothing. The irreconcilable differences of opinion speedily became apparent. It may be safely said that we all went away with increased respect for Mr. Newdegate's character and conscientiousness, but with a deepened conviction of his utter want of political insight, and possibly also with a clearer perception of the wide chasm that separates Nonconformists from the so-called Protestant party in the Anglican Church. Indeed, with all his talk about Protestantism, there was no Roman Catholic in the House of Commons who had less of the true Protestant spirit, or less sympathy with the central principle and ultimate object of the Reformation. We are told that he professed to be not a Tory, but a Whig of the olden school, *i.e.*, of the school which contended for and secured the settlement of the Revolution. If so, it is clear that old Whigs and Orangemen are pretty much in agreement. Mr. Newdegate was, in fact, the very type of an Orangeman. With him Protestantism was not so much the assertion of liberty of conscience as the establishment of a new creed, that was to be just as infallible, and just

as absolute as that from which he revolted. Of course with such Protestantism Congregationalists have no sympathy. Our faith is in the power of truth unsustained by any State enactments to defend and propagate itself. That we believe to be the very essence of true Protestantism.

We heartily congratulate our friend Mr. Mackennal on the honour which the University of Glasgow has done him by conferring on him the degree of "D.D." He thoroughly deserves the distinction, and it comes with peculiar appropriateness at the time when he is Chairman of the Congregational Union. We need not say that he is a man of great intellectual vigour and extensive culture; and his brethren, who have learned to appreciate his high qualities, will rejoice to find them so properly acknowledged by others. There is another item in the "University intelligence," in which this announcement is contained, that is very suggestive. It is the statement that, in connection with the commemoration at the Edinburgh University, Dr. Cairns preached in St. Giles Cathedral. How different the state of things on this side the border!

---

## REVIEW.

### MODERN HINDUISM.\*

THE list of works on Hinduism in its many phases is a long one, and gives the impression that new writers can expect to do little more than go over ground already well trodden. "Modern Hinduism" should satisfy any reader that its author, Mr. Wilkins, has been successful in finding a gap in the literature of the subject, and in having the ability to fill it. Of works on ancient Hinduism as found in the Vedas and Puranas there is no lack, but any one who

\* *Modern Hinduism, &c.* By W. J. WILKINS, of the London Missionary Society. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 26, Paternoster Square.)

seeks from books to have a clear knowledge of Hinduism as it is among the people who profess it as a religion in the present day finds the task difficult enough. He has to be content with such scraps of information as he may find in missionary sketches or biographies, or in the monographs of observers who have studied particular phases of Hindu life. Even residents in India find that it is only after long and patient study of the religious life of the people that they obtain any clear conception of the beliefs that form its foundation. Mr. Wilkins tells the story of Modern Hinduism so as to make it very interesting, not only to those who approach the subject with little previous information, but also to those who, though familiar with the Hinduism of the books, know but little of it as exhibited in the lives of its professors. The work has been wisely planned. The reader is conducted through the life of a Hindu from his birth (and even from before it) to his death, and the author thus invests his account with all the interest of a narrative of life which appeals to human sympathies at every stage. In a former work on "Hindu Mythology" Mr. Wilkins has given an account of the deities commonly worshipped in Northern India; in the present volume he describes the life of the Hindus, which is largely the result of the worship of those deities. Taking the two books together, they furnish an account of the religion of the majority of British subjects as full as most readers will care to have, while at the same time they form an excellent introduction to those who desire to study special branches of a great subject in detail.

Under the headings of Early Life, Hindu Sects, Caste, Worship, Woman, Morals, Death, Shradha, and Future Judgment, the author gives an account of Hindu beliefs and practices which only a writer long resident in India, and familiar with both the literature of his subject and the life of the people, could furnish. The several parts of the work are so closely related to each other that it would be difficult by quotations to fairly indicate the author's mode of dealing with his subject, but there are some outstanding features of it which may here be briefly noted.

In the leading ideas and beliefs that dominate Hindu life as exhibited in the book, the reader will find a strange resemblance to, if not identity with, those that belong to Christianity. The unity and trinity of the Divine nature, incarnation, sacrifice, atonement, pardon, regeneration, and salvation—all these are as familiar to the Hindu as to the Christian, and thus exhibit the strange anomaly that two religious systems, more opposed in their spirit and practice than probably any other two in the world, are yet closely co-related in the fundamental ideas common to both. One result of this resemblance is that the Christian missionary in India finds that the people whom he addresses are already familiar with the heads of Christian teaching, and that his work lies in the direction of rehabilitating Divine truths which have been perverted and debased rather than in announcing those of which the people, as in other lands, are in utter ignorance. There is probably not a phase of human thought on Divine things in the whole round of Christian theology that is not found reappearing in Hindu belief. The guise is hideous enough, and often grotesque, but beneath it all, even its most corrupt form, there are recognized the outlines of some great truths which mean life and power to those who receive them divested of the errors that have gathered around them. It may be that the obstacle to the reception of the gospel arising from perverted truth is greater than that caused by the utter ignorance of people who have to be taught the very alphabet of religious thought; but we are disposed to believe that to a Hindu convert the previous mental training he has had on lines of thought common to both Hinduism and Christianity must be a great advantage to him in his subsequent Christian life.

A very human interest is also called forth by finding that, both in its history and in its present form, Hinduism has passed through changes not unlike those of Christianity. An American missionary, some time ago, wrote a paper showing that Mohammedanism has had among its followers a counterpart of nearly every sect among Christians, and that the Church systems of Episcopalianism, Presby-

terianism, and Congregationalism have been and are found in their distinctive ideas among the followers of Islam. The same might be said of Hinduism, if not with regard to religious organizations, at least with regard to the relations of men to unseen things and human destiny. With Hinduism, as with Christianity, the same chapters of history appear and reappear. The conflict between spirit and form, authority and freedom, the individual and the priest, rationalism and mysticism, is seen going on through all the ages of Hinduism, as of Christianity. From Vedantism to the Puranas, from Brahmanism to Buddhism, from Buddhism to Brahmanism again—these are passages which find their counterparts in the religions of most civilized peoples. It would be easy also to discover in the spirit and aims of modern Hindu reformers—beginning with Chaitanya in the fifteenth century, and ending with Keshub Chunder Sen—much that is akin to religious reformers in our own land.

We speak of Hinduism as a "system," but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to present it in systematic form. The people who call themselves Hindus have an almost endless variety and diversity of beliefs and practices. Mr. Wilkins recognizes this in noting that he professes to give an account of the religious life prevailing among Hindus in "Northern" India. Much of what he writes would fail in application to Southern India. Even within a limited geographical range Hindu faiths which contradict and exclude each other are found. Not less perplexing are the doctrines and practices held as "necessary to salvation," and held by the same persons. A sacrifice, a pilgrimage, a gift, the performance of a vow—each of these is held as alone securing an entrance to heaven, and yet all, in addition to much else, are practised and observed as if no one was sufficient. The truth is that religious thought and faith are in a state of utter chaos among the Hindus, and any earnest attempt to hold a belief which is associated with the smallest degree of intelligence exposes them to a mental perplexity and distress of which we can have but little idea. May not the despair that thus falls



upon thoughtful minds prove to be a preparation for the large and blessed hope of the gospel?

To the question, "What will be your condition in your next life?"—they say, "God knows; we cannot say. If our present life is good, we shall be happy; if evil, we shall be miserable." A touching and true "sum of the whole matter" of the soul's destiny, to which Mr. Wilkins adds the appropriate remark: "The assurance that the Christian has of the forgiveness of sin, and the certain hope of blessedness in heaven, is certainly one of the most attractive words the Christian can offer to the Hindu."

---

#### CURRENT LITERATURE.

*Anne Gilchrist. A Memoir. By her Son. (T. Fisher Unwin.)* Mrs. Gilchrist seems herself to have been an exceedingly interesting woman, but, so far as the present volume is concerned, it is the friends by whom she is surrounded who attract the attention of the reader, and give distinctive character to the book. The brightness with which her life opened was early lost in the dark eclipse which came over her home in the early death of her brilliant husband. From that time her life was comparatively uneventful. As she took her departure from 6, Cheyne Road, where she had enjoyed such pleasant intercourse with the Carlyles, to the new home at Haslemere, Mrs. Carlyle, who with Mrs. Ireland had been watching the loading of the vans, "shrugged her shoulders, and avouched a belief that Mrs. Gilchrist would skin and bury herself alive for the benefit of her children." There was a good deal of truth in this statement, and yet a life which brought her closely into connection with the Tennysons and other distinguished people who had more or less connection with that charming region, could not fail to be lively and interesting. The reminiscences of the leaders in the world of literature with whom she was brought into contact serve to throw Mrs. Gilchrist herself into the shade. We have, indeed, a fair conception of her as a refined and cultivated woman, whose poetic and artistic genius did not stifle her more practical qualities—a devoted wife and mother, and an affectionate and sympathetic friend. But we turn to the book chiefly for the glimpses it gives us of the members of the literary circle into which she was introduced, and where she evidently was so highly appreciated. Her passionate admiration for Walt Whitman simply passes our comprehension, and the confession of faith to which another of her essays is devoted is vague and unsatisfactory; but her letters are extremely beautiful, and

reveal a true woman with great tenderness of heart and shrewdness of common sense. But it is in the conversations or letters of her friends that the chief interest of the book is found. Naturally we turn to Carlyle. Mr. Froude has at least succeeded in giving value to any record which gives us any fresh idea in relation to the character of the man. Mrs. Gilchrist had innumerable opportunities of seeing him and understanding him; and she certainly seems to have been quite capable of judging him with discrimination. Writing to W. M. Rossetti, she says that, apart from the poets, he is the only one with enough of the fire of genius in him to deserve the name of a leader of thought, and then she adds, "And it seems very curious to myself that owing so much to him as I do, and having ever since I was a very young girl been an enthusiastic admirer of him, the first thing I should ever write (that can be called writing) should be almost a bitter protest against his teaching. But he has pressed that 'stone of contempt' down so very hard and fast on our hearts of late." But Carlyle, as he appears in this book, is by no means the rough and intolerable individual that he is sometimes represented. "Surely," says Mrs. Gilchrist, "never before was there in any man the union of such Titan strength and keenest insight with soft, tenderest, pitying gentleness." The story of the intercourse between the two houses is both interesting and suggestive, but far too long to give here. The book is full of recollections, some of them no doubt extremely trivial, but all helping to give us a better acquaintance with individuals, all of whom have points of attraction of their own. From a number that might be selected we take only one. "Tennyson seems to me to be a superb fellow; only with a personality such as his, what a pity not to give himself to men! A man cannot invest his capital better than in comradeship. Literary men and artists seem to shrink from companionship; to me, it is exhilarating."

*Twenty Sermons.* By PHILLIPS BROOKS. (Macmillan and Co.) We heard it observed recently that it was open to doubt whether Ward Beecher or Phillips Brooks should be regarded as the first preacher of America; no comparison could well have been more injudicious. Each man was supreme in his own line, and those lines were so distinct that any comparison between preachers so essentially different is more than usually open to Mrs. Malaprop's well-known criticism. We have happy recollections of both of them, both in public and in private. Of the freedom and spontaneity of Mr. Ward Beecher as an orator, of his singular dramatic power, of his extraordinary capacity for playing upon the feelings of his auditory, now melting to tenderness, and anon rousing to excitement or to passion, it would be superfluous to speak. Those who heard him during his late visit to England must often have mourned, as we ourselves did, that they had not the opportunity of hearing him in his prime. Last year it was but too evident that he was hampered by a physical weak-

ness to which he refused to succumb, but over which he could not wholly triumph. In such feats as those which made him most distinguished, Mr. Phillips Brooks would neither attempt nor desire to compete with him. He is a preacher rather than a platform orator, and a preacher of a very high, refined, and cultured type. Commanding, almost regal, in presence, with clear and forcible utterance, and a powerful and impressive delivery, he sweeps along in majestic style, carrying his hearers away by the force of his eloquence. But impressive and fascinating as his sermons are when heard, they are, in our judgment, even more powerful as written compositions. In originality of conception, in clear and vigorous reasoning, in vividness of presentation and variety of illustration, and in intense practical reality, these sermons have few if any rivals. In some respects he reminds us of Henry Melvill. His subjects lie out of the common line of pulpit teaching, and yet they are always made to tell in the illustration of great truths, or the enforcement of daily duty. This felicity in the choice of his theme extends also to his treatment. The interest of his readers is excited by the very novelty of his subject. But having once secured their attention, he never fails to turn it to practical purpose. Looking at him by the side of Henry Melvill, we are conscious of the advantage which the American preacher has derived from the freer atmosphere which he breathes. It would be very difficult to put this into words, or even to justify it by illustrations; but the impression on our minds is very strong. Everywhere, in Mr. Brooks's teaching, we have the conception of a man who feels himself engaged in fierce conflict with evil, and is intent on manfully playing his own part as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. There is inspiration in his words, and an inspiration of a high spiritual character. We rise from one of his sermons with a deeper sense of the responsibilities of life, and with a more anxious desire to meet them. Mr. Phillips Brooks preaches not as the mere recluse, or even divine, but as a man who has been in the world, and who has been capable of sympathizing with the difficulties, the doubts, and the temptations of others. He is pre-eminently a nineteenth-century preacher, in full touch with those whose hearts and consciences he desires to reach. His evident aim is to rouse men to a greater nobility by the power of motives and considerations drawn from the gospel of Jesus Christ. Finer specimens of pulpit teaching we have not met for many a day than these twenty sermons.

*The Pilgrim's Progress.* By JOHN BUNYAN. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. JOHN BROWN, B.A., of Bedford. (Hodder and Stoughton.) Mr. Brown has rendered good service by preparing this new and beautiful edition of "The Pilgrim's Progress." It is not saying much to pronounce it the best which has hitherto appeared. As far as we can judge, indeed, it leaves nothing to be desired. Special care has been taken to furnish the reader with a reliable text, and much fresh and interesting matter has been added in the Notes and Intro-

duction. Its get-up is neat and elegant, and the book as a whole well adapted for wide circulation.

*Sabina Zembra.* By WILLIAM BLACK. Three Vols. (Macmillan and Co.) Mr. Black has never written a more interesting and powerful novel than this story of a young girl, whose chief fault appears to have been a singular amiability of character, coupled with extreme simplicity which certainly approached very near fatal weakness. A severe critic might reasonably suggest a doubt whether any reasonable girl, however generous her instincts and unsuspecting her spirit, would have allowed herself to be drawn into a marriage with so contemptible a creature as Frank Foster. From the first there is nothing in him which was at all likely to interest, much less to attract, a girl of such noble spirit as the heroine is represented to be. He has neither brain nor heart, and his talk is that of a sporting man who has no thought for anything outside his own special field, and in whom the instinct of the gambler is already strongly at work. The sole attraction for the heroine was the attraction of pity. But though we have it on high authority that pity is near akin to love, there was so much in this brainless, selfish jockey (for in truth he was nothing better) that was positively repellent, that it is hard to understand how a noble-minded girl could ever have been fascinated by him. But it would be hardly true to say that Sabina was ever brought under this fascination. It is true she married him, and served him with a devotion and loyalty of which he was absolutely undeserving. She drifted into the marriage under the force of circumstances rather than under the constraining influence of love. If her fault was grievous, certainly grievously did she answer it. The story of her wedded life is told with great power, and is singularly pathetic in its tragic interest. At the same time, we must confess that we are continually provoked with her excessive patience, and even worse than patience, in submitting to the intolerable demands of the brute to whom she is married. The development of Foster's own character and life is not the least interesting part of the work. At first we are afraid that Mr. Black is disposed to be too lenient and tolerant in his treatment of sporting life. But as the story proceeds we recognize the perfect art with which he has managed the subject throughout. Frank Foster is in truth a warning against the indulgence of the propensities which at first seemed half innocent, but which as they grew ultimately became his ruin. This story, we fear, is the story of only too many young men of fashion. In no respect is its lesson more telling than in its exhibition of the fatal tie by which different vices are held together. The pictures of sporting life are simply calculated to excite the loathing and disgust of every pure mind. We have a strong conviction that there are few practical lessons which there is more need to be inculcated at the present time, and for ourselves we are thankful to Mr. Black for the effective and telling style in which he has taught them.

